

Code-switching as a conversational strategy: evidence from Greek
students in Edinburgh

Exam number: 0969692

MSc in Applied Linguistics

The University of Edinburgh

2010

Abstract

Fundamental questions like ‘why do people code-switch’ and ‘what are the functions of this linguistic phenomenon’ have always preoccupied researchers in the field. The present study aims to give an account for these questions examining a group of Greek students in Edinburgh. Ten hours of recorded conversations were analysed for the purposes of the study. Following a conversation analytic approach this project seeks to illustrate how and why Greeks employ code-switching, both when they form a group on their own and when they interact with other non-Greek speakers. It was found that in both situations, the speakers employed code-switching for purposes of quotation, self-repair and for reference to culturally linked items with the one or the other culture; however, in the second situation, CS was used for a variety of different functions, e.g. contextualisation of solidarity; but not only that, as the patterns observed in the participant constellation are very diverse and perplexed. A sequential analysis brings about the meaning of code-switching in the aforementioned situations.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my friends and participants at the same time, who kindly agreed to take part in this study; without them this thesis could not have been written.

I am also grateful to my supervisor John Joseph, for his guidance.

A great debt of thanks to my fellow classmates, especially Ioanna, Manuela and Maria; their help and encouragement has been invaluable throughout the year.

Last but not least, I would like to thank my family for providing moral support and for greatly encouraging me as they have always done.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Acknowledgements

Chapter 1 Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2 Literature Review	3
2.1 Terminology	3
2.1.1 Code-switching and code-mixing.....	3
2.1.2 Code-switching and borrowing	4
2.1.3 Code-switching, bilingualism and the degree of bilingualism	5
2.2 Review of the relevant literature to this study.....	6
2.1 Conversational code-switching	7
2.2 Review of the research context in Greek/English code-switching.....	12
Chapter 3 Theoretical Framework and Methodology.....	14
3.1 The conversation analysis (CA) approach to code-switching.....	14
3.2 Methodology	15
3.2.1 Data Collection	15
3.2.2 Participants	15
3.2.3 Transcription of the recordings	16
3.2.4 Procedures	16
Chapter 4 Data Analysis.....	18
4.1 Types of Greek/English code-switching	18
4.2 Functions and Conversation Analysis	20
4.2.1 Among Greeks.....	20
4.2.2 Greeks and a foreigner.....	28
Chapter 5 Discussion and Conclusion.....	43
References.....	47
Appendix 1 Transcription Conventions.....	53
Appendix 2 Informed Consent Form	55
Appendix 3 Transcription of the recordings (sample).....	57

Chapter 1

Introduction

The phenomenon of code-switching (hereafter CS) has attracted a great amount of research as it concerns a fundamental part of our lives, communication and interaction. As a consequence the literature on CS is rich, drawing interest from disciplines such as linguistics, sociology and anthropology and creating a wide range of opinions on the question why people choose a certain linguistic variety over another one. Sociologists focus on the social factors at a macro level, anthropologists focus on a certain community and its life and culture, while linguists care to describe matters such as the linguistic performance of subjects. Within the field of linguistics itself, there are various approaches towards code-switching from the perspective of a variety of sub-disciplines, e.g. psycholinguistics, conversation analysis, sociolinguistics, pragmatics. These studies focus both on face to face interactions and written form.

As one would expect, research on English as one part of the language pair is abundant, but the same does not happen for the other language examined in this study, Greek. In other words, Greek-English code-switching is a relatively untapped source. The aim of the current study is to present an account of the functions of Greek-English code-switching in conversation in a community of Greek graduate students in Edinburgh. Many Greek people choose Edinburgh to undertake their master's degree, which requires good or fluent command of English. Due to the structure of formal education in Greece, most students learn English from a very young age (6-8 years old), though some of them never achieve a fluent level. As an outcome of living in a foreign country and participating in an institutional environment, this group of people will come in contact with its language and culture. Does this interaction affect their language use and how can this be examined through their linguistic choices? The following questions will be addressed in this study:

1. What functions does Greek/English CS serve?
2. What happens when non-Greeks enter the conversation?

The organisation of the project is as follows. Chapter 1 is an introduction of this research. Chapter 2 presents a review of the relevant literature on CS, including a discussion on the relevant terminology, and a review of the research context on Greek/English CS. A brief explanation of the Conversation Analysis framework followed in this study is given in

Chapter 3; also Chapter 3 presents the methodology and the methods of this research, explaining and discussing the participants, the materials and the procedures followed in this research. Chapter 4 contains the types of Greek/English code-switching found in this study and the analysis of the functions of CS. A discussion and conclusion of this study are provided in Chapter 5, including limitations and suggestions for further study.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Terminology

The field of code-switching has received ample research as well as many controversial views on the terminology itself. A review of the literature of code-switching will be helpful as researchers do not always agree on terminology. As Milroy and Muysken (1995: 92) point out, the field 'is replete with a confusing range of terms descriptive of various aspects of the phenomenon'. Clarification on the terms would be helpful for the interpretation of the results following Clyne (1987:741), who maintains that 'vagueness in terminology can influence the results of research.' Hence, the following terms need to be clarified: code-switching and code-mixing, code-switching and borrowing and code-switching and bilingualism.

There has been a lot of progress and improvement since the seminal works of Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1950). Weinreich (1953:1) uses the notion interference as the overarching concept for a range of language contact phenomena, treating these phenomena as negative: 'those instances of deviation from the norms of either language, which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language, i.e. as a result of language contact'. Language alternation is conceived to be an additional source of communication by Gumperz (1982) and not something negative that should be stigmatised.

2.1.1 Code-switching vs. code-mixing

The very first difficulty in this distinction according to Gafaranga (2007a) is the term 'code' itself. Some researchers use the two notions, 'code' and 'language' interchangeably (e.g. Muysken, 2000), while others (Alvarez-Caccamo, 1998; Gafaranga and Torras, 2001) see the two notions as different. In this project the two notions are used interchangeably as this is not the main focus so this matter will not be discussed any further. Therefore Greek and English are both codes, referring to separate linguistic systems.

Many definitions have been given for CS. A general definition of code-switching proposed by Gumperz (1982:59) is 'the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of

speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems.’ Myers-Scotton (2006: 241) defines classic CS, as when ‘elements of two or more language varieties are found in the same clause, but only one of these varieties is the source of the morpho-syntactic frame for the clause.’ The important point here is that, even though these two researchers view the phenomenon of CS from their own point of view, both see and use the term CS as an umbrella term to include all types of language contact phenomena within the sentence boundary or beyond that. Other researchers such as Muysken (2000) and Li Wei (2001) use the term ‘code-mixing’ and ‘language mixing’ respectively, in this sense of an umbrella term.

In some other cases, code-switching is separated from code-mixing. From a functional perspective, Auer (1999: 310) reserves the term ‘CS’ for ‘those cases in which the juxtaposition of two languages is perceived and interpreted as a locally meaningful event by participants’ while he uses the term code-mixing ‘for those cases of the juxtaposition of two languages in which the use of two languages is meaningful not in a local but only in a more global sense, that is, when is seen as a recurrent pattern.’ Kachru (1983) and Singh (1985) use the term code-switching for inter-sentential switches while the use the term code-mixing for intra-sentential switching. Moving away from a functional perspective, Bokamba (1989: 278) distinguishes the two phenomena as well, considering ‘CM’ (code-mixing) in the intra-sentential level, while CS in the inter-sentential level, thus defining code-mixing as ‘the embedding of various linguistics units such as affixes (bound morphemes), words (unbound morphemes), phrases and clauses from two distinct grammatical (sub-) systems within the same sentence and speech event.’

Judging from the above, it is obvious the there is a lack of consensus in terminology. As Milroy and Muysken (1995:12) admit, the effort to settle the confusing situation that is prevailing in describing the phenomenon of CS by standardising the terminology was proven to be an unfeasible task. What makes the situation more confusing is the fact that there are so many perspectives of a variety of disciplines and frameworks that is difficult for uniformity to be accomplished; every researcher finds their way to refer to the phenomenon either by producing a new model or by placing themselves within a framework (Milroy and Muysken, 1995). In this project CS will be used as umbrella term to refer both to intra-sentential and inter-sentential alternations of language.

2.1.2 Code-switching vs. borrowing

This distinction has been considered by many researchers as, when it is applied, borrowed items are left out so that the focus is on the cases of CS (Gafaranga, 2007a). Grosjean (1982) makes a distinction between CS and borrowing, maintaining that it is of interest why some people choose to code-switch and some others to borrow. A traditional definition of borrowing according to Treffers-Daller (1990: 259) is ‘the interaction of the grammar and the lexicon of language A with the lexicon (and not the grammar) of language B’, which she considers problematic on the basis that it is difficult to distinguish borrowing and CS from a theoretical point of view, so constraints on this distinction should be found. Even among researchers that do distinguish between CS and borrowing there is little agreement on the identification of the latter. Poplack (1980) talks about nonce borrowing, while Myers-Scotton (2006) talks about cultural and core borrowing among others. Those researchers who have made a distinction between CS and borrowing refer to the ‘degree of integration of the borrowed items in the base language (Romaine, 1989: 143) as a criterion. Morphological integration is another criterion used to distinguish borrowing from CS, even though not all researchers agree on this (Romaine: 1989). Other proposed criteria are phonological integration and morphosyntactical adaptation (McClure, 2001), Myers-Scotton’s (1993b) ‘Frequency Hypothesis’. The ‘frequency hypothesis’ relies on frequencies of occurrence to distinguish the two phenomena. Aside from the grammatical point of view, this issue is investigated differently from the socio-functional perspective according to Gafaranga (2007a: 21). He maintains that the issue is not the degree of integration of the words but rather ‘whether it expresses a function that it would not express depending on whether it was integrated or not.’ Gafaranga (2007a) claims that distinguishing between those two phenomena is important, as this affects the analysis researchers intend to do. In this study, borrowings will be distinguished from code-switches based on the judgement of two native Greek speakers, including myself as one.

2.1.3 Code-switching, bilingualism and the degree of bilingualism

Code-switching presupposes the existence of bilingualism and therefore a bilingual person. These two notions have preoccupied many researchers and again here there are many views available. Earlier views on bilingualism like that of Bloomfield (1933: 56), considered that the bilingual person should have ‘native-like control of two languages’ setting the bar of language proficiency at its highest point. Haugen (1953: 7) on the other hand, defined bilinguals as individuals who are fluent in one language but who ‘can produce complete

meaningful utterances in the other language’, leaving room for even early-stage L2 learners to be considered as bilinguals. Such definitions put the degree of bilingualism in the centre of the effort to provide a concrete definition of bilingualism. A common belief according to Matras (2009) is that the term bilingual usually presupposes a high level of proficiency in the languages involved, such that equals that of a monolingual speaker. This high level of proficiency gives to the speaker the label of ‘balanced bilingual’ (Matras, 2009: 61). Appel and Muysken (1987: 3) do not take into consideration the degree of linguistic proficiency as it is too difficult to find a standard norm for measuring the degree of bilingualism. Taking a broader view under a sociological perspective Appel and Muysken (1987: 3) define the bilingual as the person who ‘regularly uses two or more languages in alternation’ and bilingualism as ‘the practice of alternatively using two languages.’

Apart from the confusion in defining bilingualism and the bilingual person, there seems to be a consensus that bilinguals are not simply two monolinguals in one (Grosjean 1989, De Houwer 1990: 339). Instead what these bilinguals possess is another communicative resource in the conversation by showing certain preferences or contrast of language use in particular contexts (Matras, 2009; Bullock and Toribio, 2009).

Since Bloomfield’s (1933) definition of the bilingual person, research has been moving towards a broader and broader definition: Edwards (2004) states that ‘everyone is bilingual in the sense that there is no one in the world (no adult anyway) who does not know at least a few words in languages other the maternal variety; Myers-Scotton (2006) demands the minimal use of language (i.e. the person to be able to carry a limited conversation) without setting limits on the linguistic proficiency. Butler and Hakuta (2004) claim that the ideal bilingual will find no match in reality.

On the basis of all the above, it can be concluded that the participants in this study can be considered as bilinguals even though they are not balanced. There are many definitions that could be attached to this kind of bilinguals: late (Li Wei, 2000; Butler and Hakuta, 2004), successive, sequential, secondary, functional (Li Wei, 2001) and elite (Butler and Hakuta, 2004)). The bottom line of each and every one of these notions is that the person acquires the language after their first one.

2.2 Review of the relevant literature to this study

2.1 Conversational code-switching

In order for fundamental questions such as ‘why do people code-switch?’ and ‘what are the functions of this code-switching phenomenon?’ to be answered, researchers developed various theories from a variety of perspectives. Early studies which considered these questions from a social approach were Blom and Gumperz’s study (1972) and later on Myers-Scotton’s (1993a) Markedness Model, among others. Blom and Gumperz (1972) distinguish between Situational and Metaphorical switching. The former occurs when participants find themselves in different situations, where a change in code is required but not necessarily a change in topic, while the latter happens when a change of topic requires a change in the language used.

Later on, Gumperz (1982: 131) elaborates on the discourse function and interactional dynamics of CS showing that CS is an additional resource for bilinguals and considers CS a type of contextualization cue, which signals ‘what the activity is, how semantic content is to be understood and how each sentence relates to what precedes or follows. These cues are ‘any verbal sign that, when processed in co-occurrence with grammatical and lexical signs, serves to contrast the contextual ground for situated interpretation and thereby affects how constituent messages are understood’ (Gumperz, 1982: 131).

Many have argued about the imperfection of the categorisation of CS as either Metaphorical or Situational; Gafaranga (2007b) argues that some limitation in the category of metaphorical CS induced other models of language alternation to arise. Such is Myers-Scotton’s Markedness Model of CS. Myers-Scotton (1993a) proposed the Markedness model to show that certain code choices of the speakers depend on the situation and the social roles they assume. She distinguishes between marked and unmarked CS: ‘code choices fall along a continuum as more or less marked’ (Myers-Scotton, 1993a: 82). Unmarked CS can be a shift from one unmarked choice for a negotiation of a change in the rights and obligations (sequential marked CS) or the use of two or more codes as the unmarked choice to show the speaker’s identification with more than one identity (Myers-Scotton, 1993a). The key points of the model is that language choices are indexical as part of their competence (markedness/metric evaluator) and negotiation principle (Myers-Scotton, 1993a).

Myers-Scotton's Markedness Model is a comprehensive theory seeking to account for social motivations of codeswitching cross-culturally. Although this model draws themes from a variety of disciplines, such as sociology of language and linguistic anthropology and differs from Gumperz's view in a number of ways, it shares with Gumperz and other scholars the perspective that each code is socially meaningful and is often linked with various social groups, stances, or values. The Markedness Model will not be elaborated any further as it will not serve as a framework for this study.

Both CS frameworks have been criticised, but as Gafaranga (2007b) puts it, the different models of CS 'rather than being seen as competitive and in terms of one being better than the others, [they] should be seen as complementary. No approach can be exhaustive' (p. 307).

The aforesaid scholars share the view that switch is socially motivated and social meaning is embedded in the codes. There is another group of code-switching researchers, however, who work within the framework of conversation analysis (CA) and do not necessarily resort to the fact that functions of CS lie in social factors. They believe that the meaning of code-switching emerges out of the sequential development of the conversational interaction. This is the framework that will be followed in this project. Auer (1984, 1995, 1998), for example, proposes a sequential analysis of code-switching and argues that

there is a level of conversational structure in bilingual speech which is sufficiently autonomous both from grammar (syntax) and from the larger societal and ideological structures to which the languages in question and their choice for a given interactional episode are related. The partial autonomy of conversational structure in code-switching is shown, for example, by the fact that switching is more likely in certain sequential positions than in others. . . It is also shown by the many ways in which code switching can contextualise conversational activities, for examples on the level of participant constellation, topic management, the structure of narratives, etc. (1998:4).

Although Auer and Gumperz share the view that code-alternation should be analysed under the framework of contextualisation cues, their approach on how this is accomplished differs. To Gumperz, it is precisely the symbolic social meanings attached to each code that enable conversational participants to interpret instances of code-switching, while Auer (1998), on the other hand, considers that the situated meaning of CS can only be revealed by carrying out a sequential analysis, understating the macro dimensions of CS. Auer distinguishes

between discourse-related code-switching, defined as ‘the use of code-switching to organise the conversation by contributing to the interactional meaning of a particular utterance’ (1998: 4) and preference-related switching which frequently has to do with extra-conversational knowledge.

According to Auer (1984) a conversation analytic approach to code-switching has at least two advantages compared to other approaches. First, the priority of the analysis is given to the sequence of the conversation while at the same time focusing on the influence of the turns that are being exchanged. Second, it ‘limits the external analysts’ interpretational leeway because it relates his or her interpretations back to the members’ mutual understanding of their utterances as manifest in their behaviour’ (Auer, 1984: 6).

Studies like Blom and Gumperz (1972) and Myers-Scotton (1993a) are considered to be on the macro-level as they link the use of CS with ‘the group identities of speakers involved’ (Myers-Scotton, 1996: 218) among other social motivations of CS. Other researchers study the function of CS using frameworks based on a micro-level, such as Auer (1984), meaning that they place emphasis on the structure and organization of code-switching in conversation. Therefore, it is evident that these groups of research that have been created differ significantly in the interpretation of code-switching, leading to theoretical debates. The CA approach argues that macro interpretations might rely too much on analysts’ perceptions and purposes, which is a risk. Sequential analysis, however, focuses on the local, turn-by-turn interpretation of CS meaning, which is ‘brought about’ as the conversation is evolving (Li Wei, 1998: 170). On the other hand, CA has been criticised for the fact that overwhelming emphasis is placed on the sequencing and as a result social messages as well as the identity of the participants is ignored upon interpretation of code-switching (Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai, 2001). Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai (2001: 4) also criticise CA for downgrading or even neglecting social motivations, viewing CA as quite flat even though they ‘heartily agree that structural features of any conversation, especially the nature of certain adjacency pairs, can be considered devices that constrain speakers to view certain potential choices as preferred and others as not’.

Myers-Scotton (1996) points out that only a few researchers have provided macro-level studies linking the use of CS with the group identities of the speakers involved. She claims that the reason for this may be ‘perceived difficulties in quantifying the use of CS in any meaningful way, plus a distrust of self-reports on CS use’ (p. 218). A more important reason

according to Myers-Scotton (1996) is that CS researchers, who are interested in social motivations of CS on an interpersonal level, avoid macro-level studies because ‘they do not see the quantified study of the social identity features of ‘who uses what linguistic varieties where and when to whom’ as explaining the motives for employing CS interpersonally’ (p. 218).

Though the two aforementioned groups of research still differ theoretically in significant ways, there are some studies trying to incorporate both the micro and the macro aspect; such are Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) and Myers-Scotton & Bolonyai (2001). These efforts are trying to incorporate each other’s views in an attempt to provide a coherent model for code-switching.

Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) suggest that in order for an account of code-switching to be considered adequate, the examination of the social and situational context of CS is necessary, no matter what perspective the researcher is following. They claim that even though there is ample research in CS and a wealth of data analyses of CS behaviour from a variety of communities, a coherent framework seems to be lacking that would be suitable to account for these data and analyses. Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) proposed a two step approach to CS by using the CA framework and the Rational Choice (RC) model in an attempt to combine micro and macro factors. The first step is to use the social network framework to describe participants’ linguistic choices in the community level, while as a second step they proceed in a detailed conversational analysis. As they stress, ‘any attempt to integrate micro and macro levels of analysis entails a consideration of patterns of language *choice*¹ at the *community* (or even national) level, conjunction with an analysis of code-switching at the *interactional* level’ (Li Wei, Milroy and Ching, 1992: 64).

Li Wei, Milroy and Ching (1992) add that while Gumperz has not made a micro/macro link in his approach either, even though he just might not have wanted to, those who wish to follow his procedures should endeavour to do so. This would enable data sets of interactional-level analyses from community to community to be compared successfully and correspondingly, instead of having ample research concerning various communities which cannot be compared usefully (Li Wei, Milroy and Ching, 1992).

¹ Their emphasis.

Apart from these two approaches, there are accounts of the functions of CS, which cannot be assigned to the category of a micro/macro approach. Most of these studies enumerate the functions of CS, like a checklist. For example, Gumperz (1982) proposes the famous six functions of code-switching to categorise its motivations. They are *quotations*, *address specification*, *interjections*, *reiteration*, *message qualification* and *personalization versus objectivization* (Gumperz 1982: 75-84). In a similar vein, Saville-Troike (1982) identifies eight functions of CS: softening or strengthening of a request or command, intensification or elimination of ambiguity, humorous effect, direct quotation and repetition, ideological statement, lexical need, exclusion of other people within hearing, avoidance strategy and repair strategy. In another effort to categorise the functions of CS, Appel & Muysken (1987: 29-30) refer to Mühlhäusler's (1980) six functions: the *refential* function, the *directive* and *integrative* function, the *expressive* function, the *phatic* function, the *metalinguistic* function and *poetic* function.

These approaches have received quite a lot of criticism, among them from Gumperz himself and Auer. Gumperz (1982) points out that the first problem is with the definition of 'function' itself: there are no clear definitions and on top of that, a single label cannot capture all the patterns of a function. Auer (1995: 120) also points out this problem, adding that 'frequently, we get lists of conversational loci for code alternation and examples, but no sequential analysis is carried out to demonstrate what exactly is meant, for example by 'change of activity type', or by 'reiteration''. Auer (1995) calls for a grounding of categories used and a more in-depth sequential study of the functions, as it would be revealed that one category can contain quite different conversational structures.

The second problem as pointed out by Gumperz (1982) and Auer (1995: 120) is that these typologies of code-alternation often mix 'conversational structures, linguistic forms and functions of code-alternation'. Auer (1995) gives the example of the function of emphasis, which may be a function of CS, while 'reiteration' is a conversational structure; 'reiteration' could or could not serve the function of giving emphasis to a stretch of talk; both categories are on quite different levels.

Third, according to Auer (1995), such lists or typologies of CS may serve initially just to give a hint about what is happening regarding CS, but we cannot be sure that such a listing will bring us closer to a theory of code-alternation, or reveal anything about why CS might have a conversational meaning or function. Auer (1995) continues that the list is unlikely to become

a closed one as speakers use it in a creative manner making its function practically endless even if it were used in a specific environment only for once. Appel and Muysken's taxonomy of functions is criticised by Myers-Scotton (1993a) in that it leaves many questions unanswered, claiming that functions labelled as 'expressive' and 'phatic' are so vague that they might as well become vacuous.

2.2 Review of the research context in Greek/English code-switching

The literature on Greek-English code-switching is scarce. First, it should be noted that by Greek is meant Standard Greek and a distinction should be made from Cypriot Greek, which is seen as a variety of Modern Greek, usually described as a dialect (Georgakopoulou & Finnis, 2009). However, it is useful for a review of Greek Cypriot CS to be presented alongside with Standard Greek research, as though these two languages might have great differences but they do share some characteristics and patterns of CS.

Karras (1995) in his short paper 'Greek-English Code-switching' examines a group of Greeks in Calgary, Canada and classifies the functions of their CS according to Appel and Muysken's typology of functions. He observes that one of the most common types of switching is for *referential* purposes, especially when people who share linguistic backgrounds talk about a subject which requires sophisticated language skills, e.g. science. Karras (1995) continues explaining the other functions of Greek-English CS but he does not provide any examples and therefore there is not any type of analysis to shed light onto interpretations and meanings of their CS. In another study, concerning computer mediated communication (CMC), Georgakopoulou (1997) examines self-presentation and alliances in e-mail discourse among a group of Greek friends, from an interactional sociolinguistic and ethnographic point of view. Even though the study concerns the area of CMC, is it of relevance as there are important parallels between the function of CS into English in face-to-face communication and its function in e-mail communication (Georgakopoulou, 1997). Her data showed that CS and style-shifting is employed in the construction of the participants' self-presentation and alignments with their addressees.

In a discourse-analytic study of Cypriot Greek-English CS Goutsos (2001) examines the discourse role of language alternation phenomena: the ways in which Greek Cypriot speakers alternate between English and Greek when engaging in informal conversation. A variety of patterns in the use of English was found in his data, which were used by Cypriot Greeks for

various functions such as: sequential (e.g. boundary markers), interpersonal (e.g. shift to direct speech, marking of quotations) and ideational (e.g. qualifying a message, reiteration). Tsiplakou (2009) in her study of language alternation as performative construction of online identities, found out that Greek seems to be reserved for the transmission of factual/referential information, while English is used mostly for expressions of affection and evaluative comments. Other functions of switching identified are switching to English as a means of mitigating potentially face-threatening acts, and switching to Greek (Cypriot Greek, slang or mainland Greek dialectal) for negotiation/affective evaluation and language play. The most recent study comes from Paraskeva (2010) who examines certain code-switching patterns in a group of London Greek-Cypriots. The paper argues that that CS in London Greek-Cypriots can be functional as long as it is examined within the context in which it takes place. Paraskeva (2010) distinguishes among others the following functions of CS: as self-repairs, dispreference, coherence, requests of attention, all analysed under the theoretical apparatuses of conversation analysis.

All these efforts have offered new information in the field of Greek/English code-switching, but an account for the Greek/English CS has not been given yet. Standard Greek as a code in CS has only been investigated in computer mediated communication as mentioned above (Georgakopoulou, 1997; Tsiplakou, 2009). The only study referring to Standard Greek, Karras (1995) is inadequate as the functions of CS are presented outside of their context. The current project will try to fill these gaps, by examining Greeks' speech and how they employ their knowledge of English, by carrying out a sequential analysis for the interpretations and meanings to be brought about in from the context.

Chapter 3

Theoretical framework and methodology

3.1 The conversation analysis (CA) approach to code-switching

Conversation analysis is a set of methods for studying talk-in-interaction and the ways in which talk is organised, often associated with the name of its founder Harvey Sacks. The goal of this type of analysis is ‘the description and explication of the competences that ordinary speakers use and rely on in participation in intelligible, socially organized interaction’ (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984:1). Thanks to CA, talk-in-interaction had been proven to be orderly at different degrees (Gafaranga, 2007a).

The participants have the central role in the conversation analysis, as they are seen as social actors, whose actions are subject to the co-participants’ logical deductions and subsequent verbal actions (Paraskeva, 2010). According to Schegloff (1968: 1093), the speech of each participant cannot exist or be analysed on its own as in a conversation there is always a ‘give and take’ relationship among the participants. What follows from these ideas is that utterances should be analysed within the discourse they appear; therefore a sequential analysis should be used. (Heritage & Atkinson, 1984: 5; Hutchby & Wooffit, 1998).

Auer (e.g. 1984, 1995) was one of the first scholars to propose that CS can be accounted for by using conversation analysis. From an interactional point of view, Auer (1984: 2) calls for a sequential analysis of CS, whose ‘global function’ is dependent upon its local function – that is, in the conversational context itself. Therefore, what the researcher should do in order to arrive at an interpretation of CS, is take into account the preceding and following sequences; ‘our purpose is to analyze members’ procedures to arrive at local interpretations of language alternation’ (p. 3). This should be done in order to avoid ‘anecdotal descriptions of selected utterances’ (p. 2) or a simple enumeration of the functions, which as discussed earlier, is inadequate.

This study does not intend to be a checklist one. Functions are analysed within their context, aiming to interpret meanings through sequential analysis. Labelling of function is used for the sake of convenience and clarity.

3.2 Methodology

3.2.1 Data collection

The conversational data for this study comes from audio-recordings made over two months (May-June 2010). Data was taken from informal, spontaneous, face-to-face conversations between Standard Greek speakers who are members of a quite large number of postgraduate students in Edinburgh. Ten hours of recorded conversations were selected for closer analysis, out of a total of seventeen hours of recordings. The conversations took place mainly in the university area, where most of the participants study on a daily basis or in the houses of the participants. Part of data collection was carried out by me, and part by the participants themselves, so in some of the conversations I was present, while in others I had given the recorder to one of the participants to take care of the recording. According to Sebba & Wootton (1998), this method of giving the recorder to a participant may imply that the researcher does not have control of the recording taking place, but it can yield interesting data. Milroy (1987) points out that this absence of control is particularly important for the quality of the data, since ‘persons accepted as insiders are more likely to be able to participate in group activities and to have access to types of language different from those observable to outsiders’ (p. 64). In her Belfast data, Milroy observes that ‘sometimes the original participants would leave in the course of a long recording session’ and thus ‘it was not always clear whether all participants were aware of being tape-recorded’ (1987: 89). Something like that was bound to happen in my data collection as one group of participants that was extensively recorded was based in a certain room where friends and fellow students would come and go. For this reason I made sure I put a notice on the door so that people knew that a recording was taking place in this room. However, as all participants are my friends too, the conversations took place in a really informal way: whether I was there or not did not have any effect whatsoever on their code-switching behaviour, as I belong to this group. In those cases where participants had to carry the recorder home and record themselves, this was successfully done.

3.2.2 Participants

The participants whose code-switching behaviour is examined, are all Standard Greek speakers, who are members of a quite large community of postgraduate students in

Edinburgh. Present in some conversations are a Maltese native speaker and a Spanish native speaker, who enjoy equal membership with other Greeks in this Greek community. In total, 20 people participated in the conversations, 11 males and 9 females, their age ranging between 24-27 years old. Some took greater part in the conversations, while others happened to take part only for a few minutes due to the way the data was collected. They share a similar educational background, as, even though coming from different disciplines, they have all completed their first degree in Greece and they are currently undertaking their masters level studies. All participants have very good knowledge of English, proven by the fact that they are all managing their studies in English and the fact they are all certified in English as a requirement to get accepted to the university. The participants have been living in the UK since the beginning of their studies, that is, no more than a year. It is worth to note that they all form a quite tight-knit community, in which everyone is familiar with each other, even though they might not spend time together every day.

3.2.3 Transcription of the recording

For this study 22,000 words were transcribed and analysed for instances of language alternation between Greek and English. In the examples used, Greek is transcribed in Roman script. Free translations are given immediately below the utterances. Where necessary, a word-for-word translation is provided. In every conversation, the base language (or the language-of-interaction according to Auer, 1984) is in normal font, while the code-switched utterances are marked in italics. Parts which cannot be attributed to one or the other language are written with normal letters. The methodology of the CA approach was followed for the transcription of the data (see Appendix 1 for the conventions used).

3.2.4 Procedures

One issue that arose due to the nature of the data collection method, is that the presence of people who were going to participate could not be controlled; this refers to the group of participants that studied together, among them two non-Greek speakers (only one of them participated extensively though). A great amount of data came from this setting, having its advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, the data collected were free of the observer's paradox and very rich in terms of CS patterns; on the negative side the non-Greek speaker was, to the best knowledge of the researcher, almost always present, with a danger of undermining the actual purpose of the study, *Greek/English CS*. Therefore it was considered

useful for two sections of analysis to be presented: one that accounts for the CS behaviour among the Greek speakers only and another one that presents the same phenomenon in the mixed environment of Greeks and one foreigner. This should not be considered as a weakness of this study as it yields rich and interesting phenomena as to how Greeks manipulate their two available codes in the presence of foreigners.

Last but not least, the ethical procedures followed should be mentioned. Ethical procedures provided by the University of Edinburgh were strictly followed; the approval and consent of the participants were obtained and the participants were informed on the aim of this research on the same form (for the form see Appendix). The only cases where consent was asked afterwards was in those cases I had left the recorder unattended; still an announcement was on the door to make them aware. In any case, oral approval was asked as well at the initial stages of data collection. Anonymity is kept throughout and pseudonyms (initials that do not correspond to real names) are used in the transcriptions.

Chapter 4

Data Analysis

4.1 Types and ‘nature’ of Greek/English code-switching

Before proceeding to the analysis of the data, a brief overview of the types of CS is provided from the corpus, in order to give an idea of the linguistic practices that will be investigated. According to Li Wei (1994) it is possible to distinguish CS at three different discourse levels. In a conversation we may find two speakers using different languages in consecutive turns (Level A). For example:

(1)

1. D: *they're just statistics*
2. X: e ne afta ti statistic-iparxun kapoia iparxi kapies apofasis pu prepi na pernis ana pasa stigmí
(yes, these-there are some decisions you have to take at each point)
3. D: *yeah of course*
4. X: afta den ta ksero ego prepi na ta matho
(I don't know these yet, I have to learn them)
5. D: *it's not so complicated*
6. X: ine *complicated* re
(it is *complicated*)

Within a turn, a single speaker may code-switch at sentence boundaries (Level B). This is Poplack's (1980) term, ‘inter-sentential code-switching’, from a syntactic point of view. E.g.:

(2)

- Ohi more pali afto *how many times do we have to listen to it*
(Not this again , how many times do we have to listen to it)

The third level of code-switching refers to different items within a sentence being coded in different languages:

(3)

- Na sta valo na sta vgazi san *answered?* San *seen?*

(Should I set it so that it shows them as *answered*? As *seen*?)

This type of CS is called ‘intra-sentential’ in Poplack’s (1980) terms. Instances of such CS are single-word switches (nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and so on) and phrase switches:

(4)

1. Mu dosane *refund*
(They gave me a refund)
2. De tha figo ego gia mia ora apo edo *chill*
(I’ll be here for an hour chill)
3. D: it’s not so *complicated*
X: ine complicated re
(It is complicated)
4. Ego den boro alo diavasma *enough* varethika
(I can’t study anymore enough I’m bored)
5. Giati utos i alos thelo na to valo ke ego kapia stigma ke mias ke ehis to tetio *know how*
(Either way I want to install it at some point, and since you possess the *know how*)

Another type of CS according to Poplack (1980) is tag (or emblematic) switching, that includes tags, interjections, idiomatic expressions and even single noun switches. E.g.:

(5)

- Daksi de mas apasholi afto *to be honest*
(Okay this isn’t too much of an issue *to be honest*)

Extensive was also the use of Greek discourse markers within English stretches of talk, which have no equivalent in English. These markers are used for a variety of purposes such as attention of the addressee (Tsoulas & Alexiadou, 2006)

(6)

1. I knew her back in Greece *re*
2. What is this *more*?

Other characteristics of Greek/English CS are like those found in Goutsos (2001: 203); For example we find the delexicalized verb *kano* (do, make) and an English nominal form:

(7)

Na kani *tick* dio properties tha tu pari dio lepta
(To do *tick* two properties will him take two minutes)
'It will take him two minutes to tick two properties'.

4.2 Functions of CS and conversation analysis

4.2.1 Among Greeks

Quotation

The research on code-switching for quotations is abundant. Gumperz (1982: 75-76) mentions quotation in his list of six function of CS but he does not give any further explanation as to why this is so. Gal (1979) claims that it is relatively easy to predict the medium of language alternation as all we need to know is the language in which the original utterance was spoken. Auer (1984) does not agree with Gal, claiming that Gal's proposal is too simplistic and that we cannot rely on the language of the reported speech, but that we should treat language alternation as discourse related transfer with the purpose of setting off reported speech 'against its surrounding conversational (often narrative) context' (p. 119). Gafaranga (2007a) however, still finds some gaps in Auer's account of setting off a quotation. He wonders what sets off other instances of direct speech reporting apart from language alternation and what is it that motivates code choice, bearing in mind that there are different ways of marking direct speech reporting, like prosody and accent among others.

According to Alfonzetti (1998), the function of CS as quotation is worth deeper attention than we might have thought, as it is observed that when someone reports someone else's words or their own words they tend to change code quite often. Alfonzetti (1998) continues that one might first think that this type of code-switching happens because the speaker is trying to imitate the original language used by the locutor. She claims that some cases can be accounted for in this way. Consider an example from the data:

(8)

I: Ke **leo** *oh well no* hh ke **mu lei** *okay why?* Ke **leo** *because I'm a smart girl hh ah yes* (.)
ke **leo** *well let's change the subject.*

(And I say *oh well no* hh and he says *okay why?* And I say *because I'm a smart girl hh ah yes*. And I say *well let's change the subject*).

In this instance, 'I' signals off that a quotation follows every time with the verb 'leo' in Greek and then the switch occurs. Here the utterances reported are in the original spoken language.

However, as Alfonzetti (1998) continues explaining, such an account cannot be held as general principle, because there are cases in which the opposite happens, i.e. the speaker changes the original language of the utterance or cases in which we simply are not in the position to know whether the quoted utterance coincided with the original one. In my corpus of data this fact did not cause great problems for three reasons. First, it is very easy in this community to identify the original language that something was spoken in. Participants would either quote their professor or supervisors, or friends; in the latter case it is very easy to understand what they are talking about just by the name of the person. Second, as I was present in some of the conversations I am in the position to know who said what and third, as part of this community, I personally know almost all the people mentioned in the conversations, and therefore who speaks what language. However, this does not mean that participants will use the original language of the quoted utterance; it is also the case in my data that the direction of switching in reported speech is not automatically determined by the language in which the original utterance was spoken (Alfonzetti, 1998). Still, as far as it concerns conversations among Greeks only, it is quite easy to determine the original language. Certain difficulties arose in the data where Greeks interact with foreigners, which will be discussed later in the relevant section.

Apart from reporting someone's words, quotation can function as a humorous device in the conversation.

(9)

1. A: Irthe o V ke lei **no: e:** *because you have to show the skin.*

(Ivan came and he says no because you have to show the skin)

2. S: *the skin pio skin*

(the skin what skin)

3. A: *the a-a I have big images because you have to show e: understand what the image is about.*

In this instance A is making fun of I's pronunciation, impersonating him and adopting his voice; it has a mimetic purpose (Alfonzetti, 1998).

In the next section, the function of code-switching in reporting a story will be considered. According to Alfonzetti (1998) 'speakers seem to assign a priority to the contrastive potentiality of code-switching in order to differentiate the plurality of voices taking part in discourse'. And they can do this up to the point of modifying the original speaker's linguistic choice or of violating rules of sociolinguistic appropriateness.

In the following excerpt, 'I' narrates a story based on reporting the words of people involved in the incident:

(10)

I: ne ne tis elega ksero go ee::: tsk (.) ((imitating)) ↓ pantos mu lene oi partici- e ap afto:
(yes yes I was telling her, you know, however, what I hear from the participants from)

to *feedback* pu exo ap tus anthropous ine oti pernane para poli kala ke mu
(the feedback I have from the participants, they say they're having a great time and she)

leei::: ↑*oh* ↑*really*! haha ke tis leo ksero go ne
(says, *oh really*! And I tell her, I think so yes)

The original conversation was all in English; here the speaker is choosing to translate into Greek her own turns, while reporting her interlocutor's utterances in their original language. This contrasting of languages has as its purpose the marking of the plurality of voices by modifying the original speaker's linguistic choices (Alfonzetti, 1998). Auer (1984: 66) maintains that the use of another language has a certain relevance in the authorial context, with respect to organising the contribution here and now.

However, this is not always the case as it can be seen in the next excerpt, as the speaker continues narrating her story:

(11)

I: ke osi den ixan ksero go expectations ke pali ksero go esthanode poli kala me to
(those who didn't have expectations again they feel very well about the)

summer school (.) ke mu leei:: u:m (.) krima pu den exoun perasi kala mexri tora↓ ke
(*summer school*. And she tells me, it's a pity they didn't have a nice time so far and)

leo (.) *sorry maybe my English is not* (.) *so good*↓ *I was saying that all people* (.) *both*
(I say, *sorry maybe my English is not so good*, I was saying that all people both)

aftoi pu exun re pedi mu tetoio-
(those who have you know, this)

Here, the speaker translates her first utterance, but does the complete opposite than the previous excerpt, switching her interlocutor's words into Greek and maintaining hers in English, while choosing to switch back to Greek inter-sententially. Again, the speaker makes sure the plurality of voices is heard and still uses consistently the Greek verb 'leo' (say) to signal the turns and, whenever applicable, CS.

This contrastive use of languages is seen best in the following example, where I is narrating an unfortunate event:

(11)

1. I: ke: kapniza re pedi mu ena tsigaro ke mu kani (.) *what are you smoking* (.)
(and I was smoking you know a cigarette and she is like)
marijuana? hh ahahah! ke patheno ena paniko leo malaka ti mu leei i tipisa!
(and I'm in a panic state, I say dude what is she talking about!)
2. Y: ke esi ti tis les?
(and what did you tell her?)
3. A: what? ↑no! *this is a* ↑cigarette e (.) *pure to* ↑bacco! *and I'm a* ↑teacher! *eh eh I'm a serious person and I don't do that stuff eh oh oh*

Here the speaker maintains the actual conversation in its original language, but uses Greek to express her thoughts at the time of the incident and at the moment she is narrating the story; by keeping the original language of the utterance in English the speaker perhaps is signalling her awkward position and thus she is trying to distance herself from what happened but by contrasting the two codes and using her native language she is trying to give the real account of the events. Just as maintaining someone's words in their original language can give a certain 'authority' in the action of reporting, in the same way distancing from the event can be achieved by choosing to report them in this language.

Items culturally linked to one of the languages

A great number of single word code-switches and two word phrases include institutional terminology, or other cultural specific content. Consider the following example:

(12)

1. C: sas tin exo pi tin istoria afti e
(I have told you this story, haven't I?)
2. R: [ohi
([No)
3. N: [ohi
([No)
4. C: oti otan oli pigane stus kathigites tus ke tus dosane apo tria me tessera *papers* emena apla mu dose ena *site* haha
(That when everyone went to see their professors, they gave them three to four *papers*, I was given just a *site* haha)
R: oreos
(Nice one)
5. C: to opio ihe ekaton ikosi *papers* mu lei vresta pia ine
(which had a hundred and twenty *papers*, and he told me to find out what is what)
6. N: e lipon afto ine to *literature review*
(so, this is the *literature review*)

This is only one of the many examples in which the participants are talking about their university studies and they use English words to refer to things related to their work in the university. Specifically here, the code-switches used are all related to the dissertation they

have to write; Greek has suitable words for this concept but it is easier for the participants to just use the English ones. In addition, it would be awkward to use the equivalent Greek ones which are less tied culturally with the British environment. It could also be the case that the Greek equivalent terms have never been used by the speakers; at least talking from my point of view this is certainly true.

In the following example we see how the participants code-switch when discussing masters studies in the UK and related topics of research:

(13)

1. N: giati iparhun programata pu milas ston ipologisti ke grafi afto
(why, are there programs that you talk to the computer and it writes?)
2. R: afto legete *speech recognition* ke thelo na to kano *master* exo apofasisi tora tha pesi poli gelio thelo na kano *language processing*
(this is called *speech recognition* and I want to take a (masters) course on that, I've decided-now this is going to be funny-I want to do *language processing*)
3. N: ki alo?
(another one?)
4. C: *artificial intelligence natural language and language processing*
5. N: edo
(here?)
6. C: afto afto kane psisu
(You should do that, think about it)
7. R: thelo para poli
(I really want to do it)
8. C: ego tha kano *intelligent robotics*
(I will do *intelligent robotics*)

Myers-Scotton (1993b) classifies borrowed word-forms in two semantic types: Cultural forms, which are new to the base language culture and usually they do not exist in this language and core forms, for those items that already have equivalent ones. So, in Myers-Scotton's terms all the above types are all code-switches since they already have equivalent ones in Greek.

Self-Repair

CS can also serve as a self-repair device as it is also suggested by previous research on conversational CS (Li Wei, 1994; Li Wei & Milroy, 1995). CS may emerge when speakers are looking for a word in a particular language (Alfonzetti, 1998: 187, Li Wei, 1994), or for other discourse functions such as repetition, emphasis, and clarification (Li Wei, 1994; Li Wei & Milroy, 1995). According to Alfonzetti (1998: 187), until this problem is solved the speaker might frequently repeat their words, and in this way CS signals the solution of the problem ‘as it marks the conclusive segment of the self-repair activity carried-out by the speaker’. One such example is the following, in which the speaker is searching the correct word:

(14)

1. R: o ipologistis mu efige **egine** (.) *has been dispatched*
(My computer has left has been (.) has been dispatched)
2. A: kiolas?
(Already?)
3. R: Ne plirosa *express order delivery*
(Yes, I paid express order delivery)

The speaker in this example seems to be looking for the right word to explain that her computer has been dispatched; after a false start (*egine*) in Greek, she repairs it by repeating this utterance in English (*has been*). Conversation continues in Greek in the next turn, as this is the unmarked code for this situation. This brief pause between the Greek and English utterances shows that the speaker is processing the possibilities she has in terms of the two languages to utter the words. This instance could be also explained as hesitating, but again signalling a momentary search for the right word. A final interpretation, perhaps a bit too far-fetched could be that the speaker switched to English because probably she got notified about the dispatch in English too, so she is confirming a fact coming from the source language.

Let's consider a slightly different example, in which the speaker is not repeating the words he is trying to find but rather, he is looking for the right word but signalling it alternatively:

(15)

1. R: ke de borusane na mu dosune *replacement*
(And they couldn't give me a *replacement*)
2. A: ke ixes toso **kalo: s e: (.)** *guarantee?* (.) ela re
(And you had such a good *guarantee?* c'mon)

In this example it could be argued that the speaker is looking for the right word; this is obvious from the fact that there is a lot of trailing off and hesitation until the speaker finally switches to English to utter the word he needed. Also, the last syllable before the pause is lengthened. Paraskeva (2010: 113), based on Li Wei & Milroy (1995) suggests that such intra-turn switching that is accompanied by 'textual and paralinguistic features' could be seen as an effort to maintain the conversation's cohesion among participants.

CS for solidarity and language play

Georgakopoulou (1997) in her study of Greek/English CS in e-mail communication found that participants employed CS to reinforce solidarity with the addressee 'by sharing their shared assumptions as members of an in-group' (p.156). This can be seen in the following example:

(16)

1. A: pu ise gamo to kerato su
(where have you been damn you)
2. S: kala re *man*
(good *man*)
3. A: perases
(did you pass?)
4. S: e re man rotane tetia pragmata=
(you don't have to ask that you know)
5. A: =e::
6. S: mi me trelenis!
(don't drive me crazy!)
7. A: ton *awesome* more ton *awesome*
(the-DET.MASC *awesome*, theDET.MASC. *awesome*)
8. S: ton *awesome son of a bitch*

(the-DET.MASC. *awesome son of a bitch*)

9. A: *kita ti exume edo*

(look what we've got here)

The two friends have specific codes that denote their in-group identity; CS helps contextualise this. Also, it serves as a rapport-building discourse strategy, a characteristic of the informal communication between friends. Even swearing can signal this:

(17)

((A walks in the room))

1. A: *S gamiese re* (.) what's he looking at

(*S you are being screwed* (.) what's he looking at)

2. M: we have five minutes more so sh::

Without reason, A turns to S and swears at him. S of course does not take seriously as swearing probably is one of the in-group elements they share. It could also be argued that swearing here has purposes of languages play, which are not clearly seen here, as S did not respond in time to get the floor and M self selected so as to tell them to calm down as they only have some time left before stop studying.

4.2.2 Greeks and a foreigner

Quotation

As it was discussed in the previous relevant section of Quotation among Greeks, identifying the original language of an utterance did not cause any problem. However, in the case of the group of Greeks interacting with other foreign friends the task was proven to be more difficult to determine. I might be able to predict the medium the conversation was carried out, but I cannot be sure for the language of intra-sentential code-switches. For example:

(17)

A: I actually added Panos in the list and he **said what are these *re* dude**

(*re* is a discourse marker and does not have an equivalent in English)

We can presume that the conversation took place in Greek because both speakers are Greek. However, it is observed that in this group of friends the word ‘dude’ is used in English as a marker of solidarity and familiarity. Discourse marker ‘Re’ could have easily triggered a switch to Greek for the rest of the utterance. For this reason, it is impossible to determine the original language of the whole utterance.

Let’s consider again the previous example, further into the narration:

(18)

1. A: I actually added Panos in the list and he said what are these *re* dude?
2. S: hahaha
3. A: I told him it's a revision list *o: kolite mu lei* he says ahh OK *lei* you didn't do

(o: buddy he says he says)
4. anything important you just copied the notes and then I said fu::ck!
5. S: hahaha that's the usual fuck

In other words, it seems that the speaker can choose among ‘a range of possibilities to set off a quotation, among which there is also code-switching, either of the whole quote or of the verb only, or even of both the verb and the quote’ (Alfonzetti, 1998: 206). In line 3 the speaker chooses to set off the quotation with a saying verb in English and continue the reporting in English; when it comes to report his interlocutor’s turn, however, he chooses to signal the other voice by switching to Greek and adding the saying verb. Next, he code-switches by repairing the verb ‘say’ into English and then again he switches back to Greek. All this hesitation and this moving back and forth between languages show that he is trying to find the suitable language to contrast the two voices, which he finally accomplishes by setting off the next turn with the saying verb in Greek and reporting it in English. Apart from signalling the plurality of voices this self-repair of the speaker might be due to his acknowledging that M is present in the room. So, after settling this dilemma in choosing between the two codes, he reports the last turn in English.

In another example where M, the foreign speaker, is present in the room but is not taking part in the conversation actively, we see the same pattern of reporting a dialogue that was found in the Greeks only data. In the following conversation, A is reporting the last meeting he had with his supervisor:

(19)

1. A: de su pa pu mu kani sxediagrama ke mu **lei** *okay this is the summer* tu **leo**
(I didn't tell you, he draws a schedule and he says okay this is the summer, I tell him)
na aferesume kapies meres epidi tha pao stin elada (.) *okay this is real life*
(not to count in some days because I'll go to Greece (.) *okay this is real life*)
2. G: haha
3. A: *you do some shit here some shit here* kapos etsi haha
(something like this)

A here sets off every quotation with the saying verb in Greek, apart from the last one where he reports directly the words of his supervisor in their original language.

Culturally linked items

In a similar vein to the examples provided for the Greeks only section, but in the other direction language-wise, the following example has as its base language English, so the speaker switches to Greek to refer to a Greek cultural element (The participants are talking about a Greek dessert; there is no equivalent in English):

(20)

1. M: I'm talking about the dessert kind of course
2. A: okay but this is *galaktobureko*

In the next example, the participants are talking about a Greek girl, who is a friend of someone in the group:

(21)

1. M: she's dead
2. A: she doesn't have a picture of herself I'm sorry
3. D: should I stand up or not=
4. M:= no
5. A: *afti duleve me ton Panagiotopulo sto nistiko arkudi itan to magiko heraki*
(*she was working with Panagiotopulos ((a Greek TV presenter)) for the show 'Nistiko Arkudi', she was the magic hand*)

6. D: *sto?*
(*in what show?*)

The speakers are looking at the girl's profile on a social networking website. Upon seeing her pictures M comments that she looks like she is dead, while A responds by saying that this is not her real photograph. D enters the conversation, and asks whether it is worth standing up to see the photo; after M's negative response A wants to give further info about the girl who seems to be associated with a Greek TV show. The switch signals that the utterance contains culturally tied information which could have probably been expressed in English but would seem rather out of context; by switching to Greek A can make D relate somehow with the girl in question.

Self-repair

Instances of self-repair are not only present in this situation as well, but are more frequent than the data in which only Greeks take part. In the next example, A enters the room after being away for some time and performs self repair in the form of repetition:

(22)

1. A: *giati afto to sinomotiko ifos? Why this (.) sinomotic e: look?*
(Why this conspicuous face? Why this *conspicu*-ic look?)
2. E: I come to see if M studies

The speaker first makes his utterance in Greek but then repeats it in English. However, he either does not know the word in English so he makes up one, by guessing, or he does this on purpose to create a humorous effect. M who is not a speaker of Greek is present as well, so A could have combined the inclusion of M and a pun. Similar cases are found throughout the data as speakers make use of their linguistic competence in these two languages. This specific word 'sinomotic' can be considered as an instance of intra-word switching, as it consists of a Greek stem (*sinomot-*) and an English suffix (*-ic*). However, this is not enough for a code-mixing phenomenon to be argued, as the word still sounds nonsense and was probably intended for language play.

As it was mentioned earlier, some researchers (e.g. Li Wei & Milroy, 1995) have suggested that CS can serve functions such as emphasis and repetition. These two will be considered below:

(23)

1. A: **thes na kolibisis e**
(you want to swim, huh?)
2. R: evala lathos kodiko prin
(I typed the wrong password earlier)
3. A: ***he wants to swim***
4. D: *I'm going to be the next Thorpe*
5. R: eleos
(mercy)

In line 1, A asks D whether he wants to swim; while D would be the next preferred speaker, A self-selects instead in the next turn deciding to talk about something irrelevant to what A has just said, thus an answer from D still remains to be heard. In the next turn A has the chance to reiterate his first utterance by switching to English and this time addressing all the speakers, and what he says sounds more like a statement. D responds this time, by making a joke that he is going to become like a famous swimmer. A responds to the subject discussed this time, so A's effort was justified.

In the next piece of talk, an example of reiteration will be considered, this time in the same turn:

(24)

1. P: lipon fevgo (.) ***I'm-I'm leaving***
(okay I'm leaving. *I'm leaving*)
2. D: fae galaktobureko re
(eat galaktobureko)
3. P: de thelo re *dude* de thelo
(I don't want *dude*, I don't want)
4. D: kalitera
(better)

5. P: kalo?
(is it good?)
6. R: kala re tros tu anthropu to galaktobureko
(why are you eating his galaktobureko?)
7. P: kalo e
(nice, huh)
8. R: esi exis fai?
(have you eaten?)
9. P: kalo e *nice huh?*
(nice huh, *nice huh?*)
10. R: boro ena komati?
(can I have a piece?)
11. D: ena komati oxi giati-
(not a piece because)

Here, P walks in the room where the rest of the participants are studying, to announce that he is leaving. He does so first in Greek and then in English. One reason for this is emphasis; at the moment P is talking the rest of the participants are gathered around the table, talking about a Greek dessert D brought for them. Another reason for this code-switch could be the fact that M is present and P wanted to include him as M does not speak Greek.

Topic shift

CS serves as a signal for topic shift as we can see from the following example. A is fixing R's e-mail settings and they are talking in Greek; M and D are present but currently not taking part in the conversation:

(25)

1. A: a ap to myed ta thes hima? ntaksi(.) ke ti to (xxx) tora ela spam den exi edo
(Do you want them like this in myed? Okay. And the (xxx) now c'mon isn't there a spam folder)
2. R: exi
(There is one)
3. A: to petai sto spam(.) pu na se pari o diavolas
(Oh it redirects them into the spam folder (.) Damn it)

4. D: *should we go today or no?*
5. M: *tonight?*
6. A: a mipos den ine afto to mail su
(are you sure this is your e-mail address?)
7. R: mhh
8. D: *but I'm not in the mood*
9. A: a to pire
(ok it was received)
10. M: *go tomorrow*
11. R: *we're going out tonight because you kn-have you met N's friend?*
12. D: *no*

In line 5, D finds an opportunity to take the floor and switches to English to ask the rest whether they should go out tonight or not. M acknowledges D's question and responds with another question, asking for specification of D's question, while A and R reject momentarily D's request, as they try to solve the problem they had. D continues his effort to engage the rest into his topic, but A is still concerned with something else while M proposes they go out the next day. Finally in line 12 R acknowledges D's efforts to set plans for tonight by giving up her preference for Greek and saying something relevant to D's utterance. The rest of the conversation takes place in English and it is about D's topic, after managing to engage the rest of participants.

Requests of attention

CS is frequently employed in the data for requests of attention. Consider the example:

(26)

1. M: problem is with Potterrow (xx) like a huge queue
2. A: oh it's in Potterrow a wait tomorrow a- there's a party re
3. S: tomorrow that's what I'm saying Mr. Scruff
4. A: not this one there's another party somewhere
5. S: yeah but Mr. Scruff man
6. M: yeah true
7. S: he has very good digital [sets
8. A: [*oxi more malaka oxi malaka skase perimene*]

(No you asshole no asshole shut up wait)

9. S: huh we don't agree in music you know that so it doesn't matter

10. A: of course we don't agree in music of course!

Here, the 3 participants are discussing about their plans for the next day. A is trying to remember about a party that is scheduled for the next day, while S mistakenly thinks that A is talking about the gig he wants to go to the next day. As S goes on talking with M about the same gig, A makes his first attempt to catch his friends' attention by saying that he means another party. Seeing that both his friends are very keen on going there, he requests S's attention by switching to Greek and asking from him to pause a little bit and wait for him to find what he wants to say. S continues with a reply in English, a direction which is maintained for the rest of the conversation.

In the next example we observe a request for attention but this time for expressing disagreement:

(27)

1. D: that's better that's better I prefer that

2. A: *ohi more pali afto* [how many times do we have to listen to it
(no, not this again)]

3. X: *[tha t'alakso*
(I'll change it)

X plays a song A does not like; as the conversation is taking place in English, A attracts attention first by switching to Greek and then again to English to express his disagreement and dispreference. X acknowledges his request by responding that he will change it, in Greek this time, probably using their shared native code to express this acknowledgement.

CS as tool in maintaining the balance in Participant Constellation

In order to explain the complex notion of participant constellation in his bilingual data of Italian migrant children in Constance, Auer (1984) adopts Sack's (Sacks, Schegloff and Jefferson, 1978) description of the turn-taking system as the first point: turn-taking in its simplest form consists of two components; 'the turn constructional component' which allows 'projecting possible transition points by instructing both speaker and non-speaker(s) to orient

to syntactically, prosodically and otherwise motivated units' (p. 32). As soon as these are completed, the 'turn allocational component' is made available, i.e. who is going to speak next. In addition, based on Goffman (1979), Auer (1984) explains that the role of non-speaker can be either seen as that of the current speaker's addressee, or as the 'recipient' (p. 33). Non-addressed ratified participants are called listeners. Auer (1984) calls this distribution of roles among the participants, *participant constellation*, which serves as a vehicle of interpretation for some of the most important properties of the conversation. Code-switching serves as contextualisation cue to functions such as the following examples.

(28)

1. X: anybody will come downstairs? no?
2. A: man bring it here
3. M: we have fifteen minutes left
4. X: *D ela na voithisis*
(D come and help me)
5. D: *ti na voithiso re malaka*
(why help dude)
6. X: *ela ela ela re M*
(c'mon, c'mon, c'mon M)

X has been in the room for a certain amount of time, and now wants some help for his dissertation; in line 1 he asks for help addressing everyone in the room. A takes the next turn rejecting X's proposal and suggesting instead that he has to bring his computer here. Then M² takes the floor to remind them they have to go somewhere else, thus still rejecting X's demand for help. In his next turn X addresses D and requests his help in Greek. D is reluctant to help too so X turns to M but does not switch back to English, as it would be expected, to appeal to M's help, a phenomenon that will be discussed later on. The switch of the addressee is highlighted by the switch of the language. According to Auer (1984) such a change of addressee signalled by code-switching helps the larger constellation, supporting it and including everyone in.

² It should be reminded that M is not a speaker of Greek.

A similar function, which is quite frequent in the data, is observed in the following conversation:

(29)

1. P: e pame gia fai tha-theli kanis?
(we'll go to eat, does anyone want to come along?)
2. D: pu tha pate
(where at)
3. P: leme gia tetio gia tzami ((funny pronunciation)) gia tzami
(we're thinking to go to the mosque, to the mosque)
4. D: tha katsete eki i tha to ferete edo
(will you stay there or will you bring the food here)
5. P: e gia ki re
(there)
6. D: pigente giati thelo ama de dulepsi afto de sikonome ilikrina
(go, I'm not coming till this thing works)
7. P: min ise malakas pame na fame ke meta (0.2) **M**?
(don't be stupid let's eat then you continue)
8. M: mh hm
9. P: ***we're going to eat do you want to come?***
10. M: *where are you going to eat*
11. P: *to the mosque*
12. M: *I'm coming*

First, P asks the Greeks in the room whether they want to go to eat; D responds to P and after exchanging some turns about the place and other details, P in line 7 turns and selects M as the next speaker. As soon as he gets M's attention he repeats his initial suggestion, this time in English. His code-switching marks the inclusion of M in the conversation and so it helps to sustain communication.

A participant can select two speakers in the same turn as well:

(30)

1. G: kala den ine afto pu metrai

(okay, this is not the most important thing)

2. B: ne ala o kenurios *kernel* milame fisai re me t o pu ksekinai ketefthian ute malakies
(yes, but the new kernel is very fast, it starts up immediately no bullshit)
ute tipota bravo (.) ***M what was I's problem with the kernel? Did he tell you?***
(no nothing, well done)

G and B are talking about the new interface of an operating system; in line 2 B responds to G's utterance and in the same turn she addresses M by switching to English to ask his opinion on the matter. Again, this code-switch contextualises the inclusion of M as a non Greek speaker and gains him access into the conversation. The inclusion of other speakers and the facilitation of communication is one of the most common functions of CS observed in the data.

Participant tries to get into a constellation

According to Auer (1984) another use of CS in the participant constellation system is observed when a bystander, or a non-addressed ratified participant, tries to get into the conversation. CS serves to the redefinition of the constellation, favouring a larger constellation due to the speaker who tries to get in the conversation and not due to the current speaker:

(31)

1. G: mu lei o Rob re oti afti ti hronia dehtikan ligi perisoteri ap oti tin proigumeni
(Rob tells me that this year they admitted a few more than the previous one)
2. M: **how was your meeting**
3. G: fine (.) ke mu lei malon halarosame poli ta kritiria pu ehis isagogis fititon
(and he told me that probably this year the student admission criteria were relaxed)
4. mu lege gia ta statistika re
(he was telling me about the figures)
5. P: petixan?
(did they succeed?)
6. G: apetihan perisoteri ap oti perisi
(more students failed this year than the last one)
7. P: ne e
(really)

G is reporting to P and the other Greeks on his meeting with his supervisor. M who is a non-addressed ratified participant up to that point, takes up the floor and addresses G in English asking him about the meeting. G acknowledges the question and responds to it, but then he switches back to Greek to finish the narration. Even momentarily, CS here served M to take part in the conversation.

Participant narrows down the constellation by selecting fewer speakers

Apart from making the constellation larger, code-switching could serve for the opposite purpose, that is, the narrowing down of it (Auer, 1984). This happens when a speaker selects fewer participants as addressees than the number of participants in the last turn.

(32)

1. S: tomorrow we have Mr. Scruff! It should be good
2. M: keep it unreal
3. A: *ti epathes simera vl-vlakentie?*((S is heading out of the room without responding))
(what's wrong with you today stupid?)

S enthusiastically talks to M and A about an event that is taking place the next day; M responds to S in a playful way while A switched to Greek to ask S what is wrong with him today, i.e. if he is okay. This switch leaves M out of the constellation as he does not speak Greek. One of the possible reasons A decides to that is the fact that he worried about what is wrong with his friend and so wants to be tactful, in case it is something personal. In addition, it is known that speakers use their native language to refer to personal matters.

CS for enhancing solidarity

There are various points in the conversations in which CS serves as a medium for humour, language punning and even swearing, or in general as an effect to enhance or signal solidarity. As this group of participants share a background of common history and codes, CS can help contextualise this. The intention here is not to enumerate the functions one by one, rather to provide a few instances in which this function of CS can be observed. Consider the first example (S is talking on the phone):

(33)

1. S: na su po thes na pame na piume ena kafe thes na piume ena kafe ego tha epina ena kafe
(do you want to go for a coffee, do you want to go for a coffee, I would drink a coffee)
2. A: ((mockingly)) *wanna go for a coffee? I'd drink a coffee*

Here, A translates S's words in English to make fun of the way S talks on the phone. There is no deeper intention or interpretation here to be brought about. Rather the fact that these two speakers are competent in two languages and therefore make use of them accordingly.

Another interesting phenomenon frequently observed throughout the data is the fact that Greeks addressed foreign speakers in Greek; the remarkable thing is that communication was not hindered; instead a friendly environment was created as well.

(34)

1. X: I want to do some batch-batch conversion stuff
2. M: with what
3. X: I don't know what you'll tell me you'll see the data and you'll tell me because I can't do it manually *ela re M*
(c'mon M)
4. M: I'm also leaving
5. X: going where
6. M: for a beer
7. X: *ela more tora tha pas gia bira?*
(c'mon now, you'll go for a beer now?!)
8. M: install visual studio in the meanwhile

X wants some help with his dissertation and is trying to convince one of his friends to go to another floor, where he is studying and help him out. In line 3 he addresses M in Greek despite the fact that M does not speak Greek. By now, one would imagine these friends would have established a shared code; this is the case here, as M can recognise that X is actually begging him to help him. The meaning of 'ela re' is easy to guess, as the intonation is also helpful. However, in line 7, this time X produces an utterance that carries a more complex meaning and intonation alone is not sufficient for M to guess. Despite that fact, M responds to X saying that he should find something else to do while he will be away. In this

way CS makes the conversation tone more playful and lighter and communication is not hindered. This is more likely to happen in a group that is quite tight, signalling and enhancing the feeling that they belong in the same group. A similar example is considered below:

(35)

1. X: *ela go wash my stuff you ate from them* pios efage apo do pera
(c'mon go wash my stuff you ate from them who ate here)
2. M: It was my *galaktobureko*
(...)
3. X: only M ate *galaktobureko*
4. A: efage
5. X: **mono esi efages galaktobureko M? mono esi? Pigene plin ta tetia**
(you were the only one who ate galaktobureko M? Was it only you? Go wash the thingy)
6. M: I'm trying to do a program for you
7. X: *poso gamise pu iksera oti tha vri dikeologia*
(how awesome was it that I knew he was going to find an excuse)
(...)
8. A: ((expressing admiration)) **a re M**
9. X: *vrike dikeologia re malaka*
(he found an excuse man)

The company of friends have just eaten a dessert and they used X's cutlery, so in line X we see him asking in English for the cutlery to be washed, while code-switching to Greek to attract the Greeks' attention as well. D manages to avoid the chore of washing the cutlery by saying that he was the one to bring it in the first place, while A confirms that M ate some. So, in line 5 X turns to M and speaks to him in Greek, asking from him to wash the cutlery. Of course X knows that M was not the only one who ate, he chose to pick on him by addressing him in a language he does not speak. M acknowledges X's utterance by telling him that he is already busy doing something for X, so he cannot do what X is asking for. In line 7-9 X and A are amazed at X's ability to avoid the request by providing a valid excuse. One could say here that CS functions as minimising that chance of X losing face by making a request in another language; however the complete opposite happens in this case, as the participants feel

so at ease with each other, that sometimes will not bother to change code because they know their message will get through anyway. CS helps build rapport between the participants and functions as a marker of an in-group identity.

Chapter 5

Discussion and Conclusion

Let us consider a final piece of conversation for the purposes of this chapter:

(36)

1. A: what was that no
2. M: sounds familiar
3. A: iliahba
4. X: hthes ihe plaka o S [malaka
(S was funny yesterday dude)
5. M: [stop it
6. lei kateveni kato mu lei tu leo ti irthes na kanis na ksiso mazi su mu lei
(he comes down and I ask him, what are you doing here and he tells me, I'm here to scratch with you)
7. A: haha afu oli erhode na ksisun mazi su re man
(but everyone's coming to scratch with you man)
8. X: mazi mu giati erheste na ksisete mazi mu afu otan ego diav-
(why do you come to scratch with me, when I'm studyi-=
9. A: =giati ksinis!
(because you scratch!)
10. R: ke meta les emena
(and then you accuse me)
11. A: you scratch=
12. R: =ntropi
(shame on you)
13. A: you scratch all the time
14. R: edo ekanes group gia to ksisimo tha mu pis esi emena gia to ksisimo
(you even made a group for scratchers, don't tell me about scratching)
15. A: haha
16. S: emena tus scratchers-auto kseris ti simeni scratching
(do you know what scratching means?)
17. A: ante more ante more pigene na apomagnitofonisis merikes omilies
(go transcribe some conversations, c'mon)

18. S: glosologika pos glosologika pos-pos erminevis tin emfanisi tis leksis scratching pu den ipirhe palia as pume kseran to scratching ine afto tora kserun to scratching ine to alo to den kano tipota
(how can you explain linguistically the appearance of the word scratching, that didn't exist before in that sense, for example people used to know that scratching means this thing, now they know it means something else, that I'm not doing anything)
19. R: apoktai ki ali simasia
(it acquires another meaning)
20. A: esi-X- X invented this word X ((imitating V)) are you e-scratching
(you X-)
21. X: no no no I do not invent I'm spreading this word
22. A: you are espredding the word
23. X: I'm espredding escratching
24. R: I think I knew the word before you
25. X: no NO
26. M: no it's not used normally in English
27. X: e e but now you know what scratching means
28. M: no: of course I do

This very lengthy piece of conversation was presented with a reason in mind: to illustrate the complexities of the functions of CS, i.e. to show that the same utterance can serve more than one function. In this extract M and A are having a conversation about a word (from M's native language). X, who is studying in another room, frequently pops in to have a chat with M and A. The conversation is in English until the point when X decides to talk about an event that happened the day before, choosing to narrate it in Greek even though he knows that M cannot understand Greek. This is a common phenomenon in the group of students studied, as we have seen so far. The familiarity is so great between them that sometimes they know that it is fine to talk in Greek even though some other people who might be present do not understand. They make sure though to switch back to the shared code, English, as to include everyone in the conversation. This happens in line 11, where A repeats what he has just said in line 9 in Greek. In the very next line, participant R 12 replies to A in Greek, while A chooses English again to repeat one more time what he said in his previous two turns, adding some extra information. The functions of A's code-switching here refers to an in-joke as well: they form a group of 'scratchers' as what they tend to do is nothing, wasting time

instead of studying. R continues choosing Greek as the preferred language, and A and X conform along. Instead, this time X code-switches intra-sententially in line 16. In line 17, A switches to English again, not only to include M who is still listening to the conversation but to make a joke about a Spanish friend of theirs: in line 20 A code-switches not only on Level A, but also inter-sententially, initiating a self repair. He starts his sentence by addressing X, but then decides to address the whole group by switching to English and talking about X in the 3rd person. He continues by imitating 'V' who pronounces words that begin with 's' adding an 'e' as his native language does not have words beginning with 's', so his friends make fun of him, always with a friendly intention. This helps build up rapport and creates an environment of shared codes. We see therefore that code-switching does not serve one function at a time; instead for one instance there can be multiple functions realised at the same time, demanding multiple interpretations as in line 20.

This study attempted to describe this very complexity of CS as a conversational strategy. It was established that Greeks employ CS for quotation, self-repair, to refer to culturally linked items with one of the cultures and for enhancing solidarity and build rapport. It is obvious from the analysis that more functions are observed in the second situation, in which Greeks interact with foreigners. The patterns of CS become more complex, including the reasons for code-switching. Greeks perform more instances of inter-sentential CS, and there is a constant interplay in the participant constellation system, while in when Greeks interact only with Greeks they code-switch intra-sententially in most of the cases; the need for CS is less.

In all cases, CS proved to be a great resource, not only for linguistic purposes, but for interpersonal functions too.

In their account of CS in a Chinese community in Britain, Li Wei and Milroy (1995: 296) observe that speakers by 'building a contrast in language choice for two stretches of conversation' they are able to 'draw attention to details of the projected course of conversation and to check each other's understandings'. This is the case in this Greek student community as well, as it has been illustrated with several examples in the analysis.

The analysis in this study has followed a micro-analytic perspective, restricting itself to the text and the context of the conversations. This perspective was deemed appropriated for this community as it is too young to have developed shared norms of language choice (Auer, 1995). However, this fact at the same time leaves open the issue of the extent to which

phenomena observed in a group of speakers can be generalised for all Greek students in the UK, or even for all such Greek student groups in an English-speaking country. For this reason, a much larger investigation of the practices of such student groups is necessary across social and geographical contexts.

It should be taken into account that the present study is a preliminary one, especially since it touches on a relatively untapped source. Therefore, a call for further research in this area is imperative, so that interpretive links between linguistic choices and contextual elements can be found.

References

- Alfonzetti, D. (1998) Italian-dialect code-switching in Sicily. In P. Auer (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 180-211.
- Alvarez-Caccamo, C. (1998) From 'switching-code' to 'code-switching': Towards a reconceptualisation of communicative codes. In P. Auer (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge, 29-48.
- Appel, R. & Muysken, P. (1987) *Language contact and bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Atkinson, J.M. & Heritage, J. (1984) Introduction. In J. M. Atkinson & J. Heritage (eds.) *Structures of social action: studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-15.
- Auer, P. (1984) *Bilingual Conversation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Auer, P. (1995) The Pragmatics of code-switching: a sequential approach. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (eds.) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 115-135.
- Auer, P. (1998) *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. London: Routledge.
- Auer, P. (1999) From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Toward a Dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 3(4): 210-231.
- Blom, J.P. & Gumperz, J. (1972) Social meaning in structure: Code-switching in Norway. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (eds.) *Directions in Sociolinguistics*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 407-434 (reprinted in Li Wei (ed.) (2000), 111-136).
- Bloomfield, L. (1933) *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd.

- Bokamba, E.G. (1989) Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing? *World Englishes* 8(3): 277-292.
- Bullock, E. & Toribio, A. J. (2009) Themes in the study of code-switching. In E. Bullock & A.J. Toribio (eds.) *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-18.
- Butler, Y. G. & Hakuta, K. (2004) Bilingualism and second language acquisition. In T. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (eds.) *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 114-144.
- Edwards, J. (2004) Foundations of bilingualism. In T. Bhatia & W.C. Ritchie (eds.) *The Handbook of Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell, 7-31.
- Clyne, M. (1987) Constraints on code switching: How universal are they? *Linguistics* 25(4): 739-764.
- De Houwer, A. (1990) *The acquisition of two languages from birth: a case study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gafaranga, J. & Torras, M. C. (2001) Language versus medium in the study of bilingual conversation. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 6: 1-22.
- Gafaranga, J. (2007a) *Talk in Two Languages*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gafaranga, J. (2007b) Code-switching as a conversational strategy. In P.Auer & Li Wei (eds.) *Handbook of Multilingualism and Multilingual Communication*. Mouton de Gruyter: 279-313.
- Grosjean, F. (1982) *Life with Two Languages: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Grosjean, F. (1989) Neurolinguists, beware: The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language* 36: 3-15.

- Georgakopoulou, A. (1997) Self-presentation and interactional alliances in e-mail discourse: the style-and-code-switches of Greek messages. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 7(2): 141-164.
- Georgakopoulou, A. & Finnis, K. (2009) Code-switching 'in site' for fantasizing identities: A case study of conventional uses of London Greek Cypriot. *Pragmatics* 19 (3): 467-488.
- Goffman, E. (1979) Footing. *Semiotica* 25: 1-29.
- Goutsos, D. (2001) A discourse-analytic approach to the use of English in Cypriot Greek conversations. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11(2): 194-223.
- Gumperz, J. (1982) *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haugen, E. (1950) The Analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26(2): 210-231.
- Haugen, E. (1953) *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behaviour*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Hutchby, I. & Wooffitt, R. (1998) *Conversation Analysis: Principles, Practices and Applications*. Oxford: Polity Press.
- Kachru, B. (1978) Towards structuring of code-mixing: An Indian perspective. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 16: 27-47.
- Karras, J. (1995) Greek-English code-switching. *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics* 17: 57-63.
- Li Wei (1994) *Three Generations, Two Languages, One Family: Language Choice and Shift in a Chinese Community in Britain*. Clevedon, Avon: Multilingual Matters.
- Li Wei (2001) Lemma congruence checking between languages as an organizing principle in intrasentential codeswitching. *International Journal of Bilingualism* 5: 153-174.

- Li Wei, Milroy L., & Ching (1992) A Two-step sociolinguistic analysis of code-switching and language choice. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 2(1): 63-86.
- Li Wei (1995) Conversational code-switching in a Chinese community in Britain: A sequential analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics* 23: 281-299.
- Matras, Y. (2009) *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McClure, E. (2001) Oral and written Assyrian-English codeswitching. In R. Jacobson (ed.) *Codeswitching Worldwide II*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 157-191.
- Milroy, L. (1987) *Observing and analyzing natural language*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Milroy, L. & Muysken, P. (1995) *One Speaker, Two Languages: Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Code-Switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mühlhäusler, P. (1980) Structural expansion and the process of creolization. In A. Valdman and A. Highfield (eds.) *Theoretical Orientations in Creol Studies*. New York: Academic Press: 19-55.
- Muysken, P. (2000) *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993a) *Social Motivations for Code Switching: Evidence from Africa*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1993b) *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1996) Code-switching. In Coulmas, F. (ed.) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell, 217-237.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2006) *Multiple Voices: an Introduction to Bilingualism*. London: Blackwell.

- Myers-Scotton, C. & Bolonyai, A. (2001) Calculating speakers: codeswitching in a rational choice model. *Language in Society* 30(1): 1-28.
- Paraskeva, M. (2010) Code-switching in London Greek-Greek Cypriots: A conversation analysis account. *Newcastle Working Papers in Linguistics* 16: 108-122.
- Poplack, S. (1980) Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en Español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18: 581-618 (Reprinted in L.Wei (ed.) (2000), 221-256).
- Romaine, S. (1995) *Bilingualism* (2nd edition). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sacks, H, Schegloff, E. & Jefferson, G. (1978) A simplest systematic for the organization of turn-taking in conversation. In N. Schenkein (ed.) *Studies in the Organization of Conversational Interaction*. New York: Academic Press, 7-55.
- Saville-Troike, M. (1982) *The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schegloff, E. A. (1968) Sequencing in conversational openings. *American Anthropologist* 70: 1075-1095.
- Sebba, M & Wootton, A. (1998) We, they and identity: Sequential versus identity-related explanation in code-switching. In P. Auer (ed.) *Code-switching in Conversation*. London: Routledge, 262-286.
- Singh, R. (1985) Grammatical constraints on code-mixing: evidence from Hindi-English. *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 30(1): 33-46.
- Treffers-Daller, J. (1990) Towards a uniform approach to code-switching and borrowing. In *Papers for the Workshop on Constraints, Conditions and Models*. Strasbourg: European Science Foundation on Code-switching and language contact: 259-277.

- Tsiplakou, S. (2009) Doing (bi)lingualism: Language alternation as performative construction of online identities. *Pragmatics* 19 (3): 361-391.
- Tsoulas, G. & Alexiadou, A. (2006) On the grammar of the Greek particle *re*: a preliminary investigation. *Sprache und Datenverarbeitung* 30: 47-56.
- Weinreich U. (1953) *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.

Appendix 1

Transcription Conventions

The transcription conventions used in this study were adopted from Hutchby and Wooffitt (1998), who follow Gail Jefferson.

(0.0)	Duration of pause in seconds
(.)	Micropause
=	‘Latching’ between utterances
[Overlapping Sentences
↑	Intonation rising
↓	Intonation falling
(())	Comments
:	Stretched preceding sound or letter
!	Animated or emphatic tone
-	Sharp cut-off of the prior word or sound
(xxx)	Unclear fragment of the recording
Bold lettering	Point of interest within conversation
<u>Underlined word/phrase</u>	Emphasis added on the word/phrase
(...)	Utterance of speaker not included in the transcript

Appendix 2

Informed Consent Form

Informed Consent: Use of Recorded Speech

You are about to participate in a study about Greek/English code-switching, which involves recording your speech. Please read the information below and tick all boxes that apply. Please sign and date below to confirm your willingness to participate, once you are happy with how the recordings will be used.
Thank you.

Consent for participation

Yes No

☐☐

I consent to having my speech recorded for the specific research project investigating Greek/English code-switching (PI :_____). I have been given the opportunity to ask questions about the tasks.

Yes No

☐☐

I understand that I have the right to terminate this recording session at any point. The recording of my speech will be deleted at that time, and will be returned to me upon request.

Use of Recordings:

Specific research project use

Yes No

☐☐

I agree that these recordings may be used for the specific research project investigating Greek/English code-switching (PI :_____), and understand that these recordings may be used in teaching or research-related presentations and publications. My name will not be revealed under any circumstances.

General research use

Yes No

☐☐

I agree that these recordings may be kept permanently in the Linguistics & English Language archives, and that they may be used by the above-named researcher as well as by other researchers for teaching or research purposes, in presentations, and publications. My name will not be revealed under any circumstances.

General public use

Yes No

☐☐

I agree that these recordings may be kept permanently in the Linguistics & English Language archives, and may be made publicly available for general use, e.g. used in radio or television broadcasts, or put on the world-wide web. My name will not be revealed under any circumstances.

Yes No

Are you willing to participate in future experiments?

☐☐

Name:_____ Email:_____

Address:_____

Signature _____ Date _____

Appendix 3

Transcription of the recordings (sample)

(001-SAR)

1. A: pu ise gamo to kerato su=
(where have you been damn it)
2. S: =kala re *man*
(I'm fine *man*)
3. A: perases
(did you pass?)
4. S: e re man rotane tetia pragmata=
(e don't ask such things)
5. A: =e:
6. S: mi me ↑trelenis!=
(don't make me go crazy)
7. A: ton *awesome* more ton *awesome*
(the awesome man, the awesome man)
8. S: ton *awesome son of a bitch*
(the awesome son of a bitch)
9. A: kita ti ehume edo
(look what we've got here)
10. S: ti in afto *show me show me baby one* [*more time*
(what's that)
11. A: [revision
12. (.)
13. A: irthe o V ke lei *noo e because you have to show the skin*
(I came and he says)

14. S: *the skin pio skin*
(the *skin* what *skin*?)
15. A: *the a-a I have e big images because you have to show ee understand what the image is about*
16. R: o V milai ola ta lefta
(the way V talks is awesome)
17. A: haha
18. S: o V den tin palevi genika ine ine ine ine at-pedi kubi apla
(I is crazy in general he's he's he's simply a special case)
19. A: ine morfi re pedi mu=
(he's a special case you know)
20. A: =theli eksaskisi na ton katalavis ti lei
(it takes practice to understand what he is saying)
21. A: *I mean can can you e predict*
22. haha
23. S: aftos telika o Gibbs afto pu kani ine oti paragi mia *random* kratai ti *random*
(what Gibbs does is that he produces a random, he keeps the random)
24. A: ne ego den to xo katalavi simera tha to katalavo afta file=
(yes I haven't understood that, I will understand these today dude)
25. A: =aku aku ti kani o Gibbs
(listen listen to what Gibbs does)
26. A: tora mi mu eksigis ton Gibbs prepi na to paro ap tin arxi tora thelo na ta [paro me ti
(don't explain Gibbs now I have to take it from the start I want to take
sira na ta kano epanalipsi
(them one by one and revise them)
27. S: [mi milas
(don't talk

mi milas tote

(don't talk then)

(002-YIA)

1. I: kala oi kathigites den to xane elega sti mia as pume
(okay the professors weren't well at all, I telling to one of them for example)
2. Y: toso goal?
(that drunk?)
3. I: ne ne tis elega ksero go ee::: tsk (.) ((imitating)) ↓ pantos mu lene oi partici- e ap
(yes yes I was telling her, you know, however, what I hear from the participants from)
afto: to *feedback* pu exo ap tus anthropous ine oti pernane para poli kala ke mu
(the *feedback* I have from the participants, they say they're having a great time and she)
leei::: ↑*oh* ↑*really*! haha ke tis leo ksero go ne giati ke (.) ke ksero go osi ixane:
(says, *oh really*! And I tell her, I think so yes because you know, whoever had
sugkekrimena: pos ta lene pos to pos to lene
(specific, what's its name what's its name)
4. A: *expectations*=
5. I: =*expectations* ksero go:
(expectation you know)
6. A: prosdokies k tis proales to rotises
(expectations; you've asked this one before)
7. I: ne bravo tis exun kalipsi ke osi den ixan ksero go expectations ke pali ksero go
(yes right they've covered them and those who didn't have expectations again)
esthanode poli kala me to summer school (.) ke mu leei:: u:m (.) krima pu den exoun
(they feel very well about the summer school. And she tells me um it's a pity that they
perasi kala mexri tora↓ ke leo (.) *sorry maybe my english is not (.) so good*↓ *I was*
(didn't have a nice time so far and I say *sorry maybe my English is not so good, I was*
saying that all people (.) both aftoi pu exun re pedi mu tetoio: ti kani afto to xazo..t-
(saying that all people both those who have you know this-what is he doing?
ton rotises gia to spiti
(did you ask him about the house?)
8. A: ne e: mu leei oti den ton simpatheis ke kati malakies erxete se ligo tha mu pei
(yes he tells me that you don't like him and other nonsense, he's coming in a bit-he'll
tell me)

(...)

9. I: ke: kapniza re pedi mu ena tsigaro ke mu kani (.) *what are you smoking* (.)
(and I was smoking you know a cigarette and she is like, *what are you smoking?*)
marijuana? hh ahahah! ke patheno ena paniko leo malaka ti mu leei i tipisa!
(and I'm in a panic state, I say dude what is she talking about!)
10. Y: ke esi ti tis les?
(and what did you tell her?)
11. A: *what?* ↑*no!* *this is a* ↑*cigarette* *e* (.) *pure to* ↑*bacco!* *and I'm a* ↑*teacher!* *eh eh I'm a*
serious person and I don't do that stuff eh oh oh ke ta lipa ke leo
(et cetera and I say)
12. I: ke afti tha leei *ah because I did*=
(and she says *ah because I did*)
13. I: =gelage itan tipou kses tipou gamoto
(she was laughing she was like, what a pity)
14. I: ne
(yes)
15. hahahahha
16. A: tragiko?
(tragic?)
17. I: gamati?
(cool?)
18. I: ke tis leo ksero go na kaleso ena taxi: (.) tis leo ante gia ke ta lipa ti vazo sto taxi
(and I tell her you know, should I call a taxi? I say bye to her etc. I put her in the taxi)
19. parapatouse sto taxi ke: fevgontas anigei tin porta kseris opos ine periergi i porta ke
(she was stumbling in the taxi and as she was leaving she opens the door you know
this door is a little weird and)
20. mu leei (imitating) *I'm so sorry that the participants are not happy with the summer*
(and she tells me *I'm so sorry that the participants are not happy with the summer*
school hahhaa kollima
(*school*, she couldn't get over it)

21. A: e ama ixe katevasi oli tin kava
(well, if she had drunk a lot)

(003-CMR)

1. C: den iparxi kapio pu na tu na ta akui mono tu ke na ta grafi
(isn't there some program that listens and writes them on its own?)
2. R: den exume ftasi os eki oxi
(we haven't reached that point yet)
3. N: giati iparhun programata pu milas ston ipologisti ke grafi afto
(why, are there programs that you talk to the computer and it writes?)
4. R: afto legete *speech recognition* ke thelo na to kano *master* exo apofasisi tora tha pesi poli gelio thelo na kano *language processing*
(this is called *speech recognition* and I want to take a (masters) course on that, I've decided-now this is going to be funny-I want to do *language processing*)
5. N: ki alo?
(another one?)
6. C: *artificial intelligence natural language and language processing*
7. N: edo
(here?)
8. C: afto afto kane psisu=
(You should do that, think about it)
9. R: =thelo para poli
(I really want to do it)
10. C: ego tha kano *intelligent robotics*
(I will do *intelligent robotics*)
11. R: exun poli kalo tmima
(their department is pretty good)
12. C: ela tha maste mazi
(come, we'll be together)
13. R: para polu oreas=
(that's great)
14. C: =*high five*!
15. R: re em: (.) oi li[nguistics
(the)

16. C: [artificial intelligence high five]
17. R: entaksi ego den ime ke poli tu *AI*
(okay I can't really do *AI*)
18. C: ne ala afto iparxi mono den iparxi kati alo
(yes but this the only thing there is, there isn't anything else)
19. R: skeftomuna kseris *machine translation speech recognition* tetia pragmata
(I was thinking you know *machine translation speech recognition* stuff like that)
20. C: exis vri kapoio sigkekrimeno metapixiako to opio na onomazete etsi
(have you found a specific master's with that name?)
21. R: exume *language processing* ke exume ke *evolution* fff *language cognition*
evolution and cognition
(we have *language processing* and we also have *evolution language cognition*
evolution and cognition)
22. N: edo?
(here?)
23. C: sto linguistics?
(in the linguistics department?)
24. R: ne ine se mas ine sto ktirio mas ala afti ine *computational linguistics* ke
sinergazonte ke me tus dikus sas me olus ap to *forum* re pedi mu
(yes it is in our building but they are doing *computational linguistics* and they are co-
operating with your staff as well with everyone at the *forum* you know)
25. N: tus ee se ligo dikus sas
(your people in a while)
26. R: diladi ine atoma pu kanune exun dikus mu kathigites ke kathigites ton pedion
(that is, they are people that have my professors and professors of the guys)

(...)
27. R: *language evolution and cognition* i *language processing* den ksero ola orea mu
fenonte
(*language evolution and cognition* or *language processing*, I'm not sure everything
sounds nice to me)
28. C: *natural languages and languages* e: ti lei *synthesis* afto na kanis *artificial*
intelligence asta ta ipolipa ine florika

(*natural languages and languages*, what's the name, *synthesis*-this one you should do
artificial intelligence, leave all the rest they're indifferent)

29. R: den ksero an me perni re pedi mu

(I don't know if I can do it, you know)

30. C: thes na ise gamati se afto ton tomea i thes na ise floros se afton ton tomea

(do you want to be the best in this field or do you want to be a geek in this field)

31. R: thelo na me gamati

(I want to be the best)

32. C: e opote tha kanis *artificial intelligence*

(there you go, you'll do *artificial intelligence* then)

33. R: den ksero an me [perni

(I don't know if I can do it)

34. N: [epidi tha to kanis esi e?

(because you'll do that huh?)

35. R: egefalika

(brain-wise)

hahaha

36. R: tha kanis afto *natural language*?

(will you *do natural language*?)

37. C: oxi tha kano *intelligent robotics* ego

(no, I'll do *intelligent robotics*)

38. R: entaksi s-san to S

(okay, like S is doing)

39. C: ne bravo i afto i *learning from data* den exo apofasisi akoma

(right, either this or *learning from data*, I haven't decided yet)

(...)

40. C: tha sto stilume na to dokimasis

(we'll send it over for you to try it on)

41. A: na ine *signed for* omos min exume ki alla

(it has to be signed for though, we don't need trouble)

42. C: tha grapsume ke apekso empisteftiko

(we will write confidential on it)

43. N: *top secret*

(...)

44. N: orea orea *I'm looking forward to that* pos ke pos

(nice nice *I'm looking forward to that*, a lot)

(004-ARDM)

1. R: ti ine afto re dream theater *desktop*?

(what's that dream theater *desktop*?)

2. A: ne=

(yes)

3. R: =oxi

4. A: ine gia na dixno poso gamatos fan ton dream theater ime

(I want to show that I'm a big dream theater fan)

5. R: ma esi d-den

(but you don't-)

6. A: to ksero to evala epitides ela

(I know, I did it on purpose, c'mon)

7. D: *I'm going to the pool*

8. M: bye

9. A: the pool my ass we don't care

10. D: I know (.) are you going to be here for the next hour

11. A: no

12. M: no

13. A: this question again

14. A: kala=

(okay-)

15. M: =take your stuff

16. A: orea ti ixis kani tora (what have you done now)

(005-ADMRVX)

9. X: I want to do some batch-batch conversion stuff

10. M: with what

11. X: I don't know what you'll tell me you'll see the data and you'll tell me because I can't do it manually *ela re M*

(c'mon M)

12. M: I'm also leaving=

13. X: =going where

14. M: for a beer=

15. X: =*ela more tora tha pas gia bira?*

(c'mon now, you'll go for a beer now?!

16. M: install visual studio in the meantime

17. X: what

18. M: install visual studio in the meantime

19. X: me?

20. M: no me of course you

21. X: why

22. A: wait wait what do you want to do what do you want to do

23. X: why visual studio

24. M: because you can do C++ witha data and C sharp

25. A: what do you want [to do

26. X: [and who told you that I want to do C sharp

27. M: I said C++

28. X: no not but ++

29. A: he said no but ++ in fact it's it's a notepad what do you want to do though

30. X: *ela kato na me voithisis*

(come down and help me)

31. A: ne ti thes na kanis

- (what do you want to do)
32. X: thelo na peraso exi dedomena o malakas o alos
(I want to get the data in, the other asshole)
33. A: ne
(yes)
34. X: ki exi as pume ksero go imerominia dedomeno A stili ksero go ne entaksi
[imerominia kseris
(and you know, there is the date, the data, column A and you know okay the date you know)
35. A: [orea
(okay good)
36. X: ke thelo na pao na paro tis [stiles
(and I want to take the columns)
37. A: [a-ama tin kitazis niothi perierga vlepis kita girnai tora pai
sti gonia
(if you look at her she feels strange, look she will turn to the corner now)
38. R: haha den mporo
(haha I can't)
39. A: *if you look at her she feels strange look look*
40. R: if three people are looking at me yes then you look weird
41. A: hehe e don't try to put yourself outside of the seat don't try eh
42. X: *megali ataka*
(big line this one)
43. R: olo diko su afto
(that was all yours)
44. A: gia-ti ti xriazese ena aplo *converter* thes diladi ena *tokeniser* you want a *tokeniser*
(why-what what do you need, a simple *converter* is what you want a *tokeniser* you want a *tokeniser*)
45. X: (xxx) *e how are you*
46. A: *tokeniser* de thes?
(don't you want a *tokeniser*?)
47. X: den ine akrivos su lei den ine standard i morfi tu den ine *fixed* diladi exi kati *headers*
periergus
(it's not that exactly-it's type is not standard, it's not *fixed*, it has some weird *headers*)

48. A: *reg expe-regular expressions?*=
49. M: =no no:
50. X: den ksero apo fta
(I don't know how to deal with these things)
51. A: you want a tokeniser man you just type e:=
52. M: =what do you have
53. X: e come downstairs and I will gi-eh tell you
54. D: you can come upstairs one of the
55. A: actually yes you can bring your data down
56. D: one of the forks
57. A: e?
58. X: hmm if you want we can go play *tetio* table tennis table tennis in informatics forum
(if you want we can go play, *whats its name*, table tennis table tennis in infromatics forum)
- (...)
59. X: *D na su valo musiki*=
(D, can I put some music for you to listen)
60. A: =psst no no no e if you're gonna:=
61. X: =psst e=
62. A: =change it wait wait wait [so that it gets to two four six man two four six c'mon don't ruin it
63. X: *ti tha valume tora enia* [ogdonta tria ela na valume musiki
(what are we going to put now, nine, eighty-three come to play some music)
64. A: wai-wai-wait don't ruin it
65. X: *oxi re malaka*
(no you asshole)
66. D: *afu s'aresi ela to ksero afu s'aresi*
(but you like it, I know that you like it)
67. A: *ne ala thelo na akuso afto tora exis na akusis tin alagi*
(yes but I want to listen to this one now, you have to hear the change)
68. D: *meta meta ta spai omos*
(yes, but later on it's awesome)

(...)

69. A: so who's coming for poker I'm going now

70. R: you're playing poker ?

71. A: e yeah two hours something like this

72. R: I was going to but I think it's very

73. D: what

74. R: *poli kapsimo*

(it's a waste of time)

75. A: pio pedi mu?

(which thing?)

76. R: to poker

(poker)

77. A: siga more

(c'mon, no)

78. X: na rtho ke ego gia poker les

(should I come for poker too)

79. A: esi den exis provlima (.) esi den mporis na stamatisis na pontaris *man*

(you don't have a problem, you can't stop betting *man*)

80. X: ti les more apla den ksero tus algorithmus den ksero pos dulevi akrivos to poker

(what are you talking about, it's just that I don't know the algorithms, I don't know how poker works exactly)

81. A: pius algorithmus re gav gav den mporis na stamatisis na pontaris file

(what algorithms you fool, you just can't stop betting buddy)

82. D: *they're just statistics*

83. X: e ne afta ti statistik-iparxun kapia uparxi kapias apofasis pu prepi na pernis ana

pasa stigmi

(yes, these-there are some decisions you have to make at any point)

84. D: *yeah of course*

85. X: afta den ta ksero ego afta prepi na matho

(I don't know those, I have to learn those)

86. D: *it's not so complicated*

87. X: ine *complicated* re

(it is *complicated*)

88. D: *MLPR was more complicated*
89. A: nope nope MLPR was very easy in comparison to
90. D: so actually I'm really good at MLPR right now
(...)
91. X: *ela go wash my stuff you ate from them* pios efage apo edo pera
(c'mon *go wash my stuff you ate from them*, who ate here)
92. D: it was my galaktobureko
93. X: e?
94. D: it was my galaktobureko
95. X: orea esi den plenis (.) A?
96. A: e:
97. X: efages galaktobureko
(did you eat galaktobureko?)
98. R: ego efevga
(I was leaving)
99. A: no
100. X: den efages
(didn't you eat?)
101. A: *only Marco ate galaktobureko*
102. A: efage
(he did)
103. X: mono esi efages galaktobureko Marco? mono esi? pigene plin ta tetia
(you were the only one who ate galaktobureko M? Was it only you? Go wash the thingy)
104. M: *I'm trying to do a program for you*
105. X: poso gamise pu iksera oti tha vri dikeologia
(how awesome it was that I knew he was going to find an excuse)
106. R: tha pao ego tha pao ego
(I'll go, I'll go)
107. Hahaha
108. X: den iksera oti tha (xxx) sta elinika iksera oti tha ton rotusa
(he didn't know I was going to (xxx) in Greek, he knew I was going to ask him)
109. A: a re Marco
110. X: vrike dikeologia re malaka

111. A: *you are wrong-one guy one story man*
 112. M: *what are you doing there*
 113. R: *pu exete na ta plino*
 (where can I wash these)
 114. X: *ekso*
 (outside)

(005-ADMB)

1. A: why did you bring stuff to Marco?
2. M: cause he loves me
3. G: yeah
4. A: he asked th- for them
5. G: I asked him I remember that he liked e:
6. A: feta?
7. G: feta
8. A: and why didn't you ask me I like feta as well
9. G: yeah but you're Greek
10. A: so what do I have *feta* here? do I look like I have *feta* here
11. G: tell you mother to send you some
12. M: ((imitating)) tell your mother
13. G: to send you some
14. A: eeh no nah
15. G: ((making fun of A)) nah nah nah I'm A nah nah nah
16. A: *ante gamisou*
 (go fuck yourself)
17. G: (.) *ti ora skasate edo?*
 (what time did you come here?)
18. A: *deka*
 (ten)
19. G: *deka? ke esi deka eskases?*
 (ten? Did you come at ten as well?)
20. D: before one hour (.)

21. G: *irthes pos ke den irthes ke esi ap to spiti*
(how come you never came by the house yesterday?)
22. D: *e: i pigam-pu fevgane ta pedia re sto library bar*
(we went-the guys were leaving, at the library bar)
23. A: *okay did they leave now? done?*
24. D: *yeah I think so*
25. G: *Galena [and*
26. D: [*actually I sit there for half an hour and then went home to sleep*
27. M: *yeah but it was fun*
- (...)
28. B: D *ehis hrisimopoiisi-ehis vali pote ton eksoteriko su skliro sta mihanimata tu dice?*
(D, have you ever put your external disk on the *dice* machines?)
29. D: *oxi giati? (.) den ksero an exi provlima*
(no, why? I don't know if there's any problem)
30. B: *ehi haha*
(there's a problem)
31. D: *ne?*
(yes?)
32. B: *ne giati ego exo NTFS ke i malakes edo i admin den to xune vali na to ipostirizi*
(yes, because I'm using *NTFS* and the stupid *admin(s)* here haven't set it so as to be supported)
33. D: *are you sure na dokimassume*
(are you sure? We should try)
34. B: *dokimase to*
(try it)
35. D: *katse ligo (.) to vrikes?*
(wait for a moment. Did you find it?)
36. A: *ne a kati ipe omos*
(yes, but it said something)
37. B: *cannot mount device=*
38. A: *=ti ehi mesa*
(what does it have inside?)
39. B: *NT[FS*

40. A: *[user manuals*
41. D: oxi afto ine to ena komati to alo komati thelume
(no, this one part, we need the other part)
42. A: pio ine to alo komati
(what's the other part?)
43. B: e de su leo den ipostirizi *NTFS* to sistima ine malakes edo
(I'm telling you, the system here doesn't support *NTFS*, they're stupid here)
44. A: pos legete
(how is it called)
45. D: *password my password=*
46. B: *=my password*
47. D: a vriski mono to ena komati asto svisto vgalto e: ohi B den boris
(oh it finds only the one part, let it, let it, delete it, no B you can't)
48. M: haha
49. A: ksa su pu-pu ine?
(why do you care-where is it?)
50. D: emena rotas
(are you asking me)
51. A: kala parto ekso tora
(okay take it outside now)
52. D: kala sto telos tha ta haso ola ta pragmata tha haso ke tin ptihiaki mu
(okay, in the end I'll lose all my things, I'll lose my dissertation as well)
53. haha
54. A: *you remind me of a guy in Greece he sent an e-mail once guys does anyone has anyone seen a: usb stick because I had all my diploma in it*
55. M: *yes*
56. A: *and I don't have a copy*
57. B: *it has happened to: my: to university too*
58. D: *yeah but it's stupid for a computer scientist to say you had a diploma and you lost it in a stick*
59. M: *yes it is but doesn't it mean that there're not stupid computer scientists*
60. A: *true that's true*
- (...)

61. P: e: pame gia fai tha rthi kanis?
(we'll go to eat, does anyone want to join?)
62. A: oi
(nope)
63. P: oi e
(nope huh)
64. A: oxi den pinao
(no I;m not hungry)
65. P: esi exis fai
(have you eaten)
66. A: hoi
(nope)
67. P: e pame gia fai tha-theli kanis?
68. (we'll go to eat, does anyone want to come along?)
69. D: pu tha pate
(where at)
70. P: leme gia tetio gia tzami ((funny pronunciation)) gia tzami
(we're thinking to go to the mosque, to the mosque)
71. D: tha katsete eki i tha to ferete edo
(will you stay there or will you bring the food here)
72. P: e gia ki re
(there)
73. D: pigente giati thelo ama de dulepsi afto de sikonome ilikrina
(go, I'm not coming till this thing works)
74. P: min ise malakas pame na fame ke meta (0.2) M?
(don't be stupid let's eat then you continue)
75. M: mh hm
76. P: *we're going to eat do you want to come?*
77. M: *where are you going to eat*
78. P: *to the mosque*
79. M: *I'm coming*
80. P: *sweet (.) why is this blue*
81. M: *because it doesn't is not sending red for some reason*
82. P: tss

83. D: thes na to ksanakatevasis to alo den to vrisko aparetito
(do you want to download again the other one, I don't think it's necessary)
84. M: *are you going now*
85. P: *in five minutes let's say*
86. M: *ok I'm waiting*
87. P: haha *OK let's go now* e: exis setari katholu ektupotes
(haah OK, let's go now. Have you ever set up printers?)
88. A: edo ?
(here?)
89. P: ne na ektiponis apo do
(yes, so that you can print here)
90. A: den exo den to xo psaksi den ksero an boris na to kanis
(I haven't, I don't know if you can do it)
91. P: boris re dude boris apla de dulevun kapia *url*
(you can do it dude, you can do it, it's just that some *url* do not work)
92. A: to *wireless*?
(the *wireless*?)
93. P: e: den to xo psaksi
(I don't know yet)